

## NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate April 9 (legislative day of March 30), 1942:

## COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Raymond Miller, of Galatea, Colo., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 47, with headquarters at Denver, Colo. (reappointment).

## CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 9 (legislative day of March 30), 1942:

## UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

Rear Admiral Howard L. Vickery to be a member of the United States Maritime Commission.

## COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

## TO BE DIRECTOR

Leo Otis Colbert to be Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

## TO BE JUNIOR HYDROGRAPHIC AND GEODETIC ENGINEER

William Rude Jackson.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, APRIL 9, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. Cox.

The Reverend Hugh W. Glenn, Wesley Chapel Methodist Church, New Albany, Ind., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, we thank Thee for the constant access that we have to the throne of grace, through our Lord Jesus Christ. Bestow Thou upon our beloved President, our Senate, and this assembled House, all those graces and virtues that will make them acceptable to Thee. May Thy guiding Spirit incline these Thy servants to register their patriotic devotion on the side of truth, righteousness, purity, and justice by the dedication of themselves to Thee and to the sacred rights of human freedom. Add strength to their faith, ardor to their love, and help them to seek the heights of open fellowship with Thee. Renew their physical strength, give them the courage of their convictions, and unite them in singleness of heart and purpose. Out of our confusion and despair, help us to see that in Thy will is our peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, April 6, 1942, was read and approved.

## MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On April 6, 1942:

H. R. 3722. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. S. W. McIlwain;

H. R. 4151. An act to authorize the acquisition by the United States of lands lying

between the present boundary of the Naval Air Station, Lakehurst, N. J., and the new boundary of Fort Dix, in the county of Ocean and State of New Jersey;

H. R. 4464. An act for the relief of Henry J. McCloskey;

H. R. 4557. An act for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Edna B. Crook;

H. R. 4955. An act for the relief of Geoffrey Orme;

H. R. 5069. An act for the relief of George Garcavy;

H. R. 5363. An act for the relief of Johnston-Hall Hospital, Calhoun, Ga., and Dr. Z. V. Johnston, Calhoun, Ga.;

H. R. 5452. An act for the relief of Emmett Armstrong;

H. R. 6005. An act to authorize cases under the Expediting Act of February 11, 1903, to be heard and determined by courts constituted in the same manner as courts constituted to hear and determine cases involving the constitutionality of acts of Congress, and further to define the powers of a district judge in certain suits;

H. R. 6360. An act to amend the act known as the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, 1930 (46 Stat. 531), approved June 10, 1930, as amended; and

H. R. 6714. An act for the relief of Daniel Elliott and Helen Elliott.

On April 8, 1942:

H. R. 639. An act for the relief of Edd Nevins;

H. R. 710. An act for the relief of Martin N. Mayrath;

H. R. 3091. An act for the relief of Martin J. Price;

H. R. 3732. An act for the relief of Ida Baird;

H. R. 4099. An act for the relief of Onie Martin and Betty Martin;

H. R. 5559. An act for the relief of William Horsman;

H. R. 5652. An act to relieve certain employees of the Veterans' Administration from financial liability for certain overpayments and allow such credit therefor as is necessary in the accounts of certain disbursing officers, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5866. An act for the relief of the city of Atlanta, Ga.;

H. R. 5977. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. F. Wilder Temple;

H. R. 6273. An act to amend the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code by setting new maximum limits on allowances for losses of distilled spirits by leakage or evaporation while in internal revenue bonded warehouses, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6387. An act to extend the crediting of military service under the railroad retirement acts, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6440. An act to authorize the renewal of the lease of the old naval hospital in the District of Columbia for an additional period of 15 years.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 263. Joint resolution to provide decorations for outstanding conduct or service by persons serving in the American merchant marine.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments, in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6868. An act making additional appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. McKellar, Mr. Glass, Mr. Hayden, Mr. Tydings, Mr. Russell, Mr. Overton, Mr. Thomas of Oklahoma, Mr. McCarran, Mr. O'Mahoney, Mr. Bankhead, Mr. Nye, Mr. Lodge, Mr. Holman, and Mr. Brooks to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

## ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had on April 7, 1942, examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6483. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority granted to the Chair on April 6, 1942, the Chair did on Tuesday, April 7, 1942, sign the enrolled bill of the House, H. R. 6483, entitled "An act to amend the act entitled 'An Act to Expedite the Provision of Housing in Connection With National Defense and for Other Purposes,' approved October 14, 1940, as amended."

## ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] may have permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit two consent requests: First to extend my own remarks in the Record and include an editorial from the Saturday Democrat, of Holyoke, Mass.; and second to extend my remarks and include excerpts from a recent speech by Gov. Frank M. Dixon, of Alabama, pointing out some of the things we must dispense with in order to win the war.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is ordered.

There were no objection.

## PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next after the disposition of the legislative business for the day I may address the House for 25 minutes on the subject Labor in the War Effort.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PADDOCK) may have permission to extend his own remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record in two instances and insert resolutions adopted by the legislature of my State.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

## CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION OF ESTABLISHMENT OF BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, today the board of education of my city is 100 years old. Although the bill establishing the original board was passed by the legislature on April 9, 1842, city-wide observance of the anniversary will be postponed until next week because the schools are now in recess for the Easter holidays.

Exhibitions and observances will be held throughout the city and 1,000,000 children will learn what it means to write on slates, do arithmetic on an abacus, and peruse McGuffey's reader. On Tuesday 732 schools will be conducted for at least part of the day in the manner of 1842.

Boys with dirty faces will be washed by girls before their classes. Some will wear dunce caps. Oral examinations will be conducted by visiting trustees. There also will be exhibitions of the new education system. The celebration will close with a dinner at the Hotel Waldorf-Astoria on April 20.

Should you be in New York City next week we would be pleased to have you pay a visit to one of our schools.

## VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—HARRY KAHN

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read:

*To the House of Representatives:*

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 4665, to provide for the payment of the sum of \$3,000 to Harry Kahn, as compensation for personal injuries sustained by him as a result of an accident involving an Army truck.

It appears that on the evening of April 16, 1931, an Army truck was proceeding northward on the Washington-Richmond Highway, bound for Fort Humphreys, Va. Upon approaching the entrance of the fort, the driver reduced his speed in order to make a right-hand turn into the gateway. As he did so, the engine stalled and the vehicle came to a stop, a short distance south of the

gate entrance. The driver attempted to crank the engine and encountered some difficulties. A tail light of a kerosene type was burning at the rear of the truck.

At about the same time Mr. Kahn was driving a passenger automobile in the same direction, and crashed into the truck from the rear. As a result of the collision he sustained personal injuries and a passenger riding with him was killed. Mr. Kahn apparently asserts that he was unable to see the tail light of the truck, owing to the fact that he was blinded by lights from oncoming traffic, but does not contend that he made any effort to stop or slow down when he was unable to see the road ahead of him.

It does not appear that the driver of the Government vehicle was guilty of any negligence whatsoever. I am unable to agree with the suggestion that it was his duty to place a flare back of the truck, since the truck was stalled only momentarily, and he was attempting to get the engine started. Moreover, I am advised that the existing provision of the Virginia Code, requiring flares or torches to protect any bus or truck that is disabled and stops upon the highway, did not become law until 1938, while the accident here involved occurred in 1931.

While the lamentable results of the collision are to be deplored, there does not appear to be any moral obligation on the part of the Government to compensate the claimant under the circumstances.

In view of the foregoing considerations, I feel constrained to withhold my approval from the bill.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 9, 1942.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, further consideration of the message will be postponed until April 13.

There was no objection.

## VETO MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—RELIEF OF H. J. ABNEY

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States, which was read:

*To the House of Representatives:*

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 5504, "For the relief of H. J. Abney."

This enrolled bill would authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to H. J. Abney, Columbia, S. C., the sum of \$1,419.50, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained when he was shot and wounded by a military policeman in Columbia, S. C., on February 22, 1941.

On the night of February 22, 1941, the military policeman in question, Corporal Vilas L. Davis, military police detachment, Fort Jackson, S. C., on duty in the city of Columbia, S. C., was dispatched, under competent orders, with two privates, to investigate a disorder at the University Lunch in the city of Columbia, in response to a telephone call in

which it was stated that a soldier was involved in the disorder. In the investigation following, Corporal Davis became involved in an altercation with Mr. Abney, which resulted in the shooting of Mr. Abney by Corporal Davis.

Corporal Davis was tried on May 2, 1941, by general court-martial for assault upon Homer J. Abney, with intent to do him bodily harm, by shooting him in the thigh with a pistol. The accused defended on grounds of self-defense and was acquitted by the court. It must be borne in mind that this court observed the witnesses and weighed the evidence submitted.

While the action of the court in absolving the accused from criminal liability is not determinative of the question of any moral obligation of the United States to come to the aid of one injured through the acts of its agents acting under color of office, or otherwise, the substantial showing that the injured party was the aggressor negatives such obligation. The evidence is clear that Mr. Abney took the law in his own hands in the matter of the collection of a small debt, and that his conduct created the disturbance which resulted in his injury. This, coupled with his acts of aggression committed against Corporal Davis, is convincing that there is not only no legal but no moral basis for the proposed relief.

In this view of the matter, the approval of this enactment would establish a precedent contrary to sound public policy.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 9, 1942.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, further consideration of the message will be postponed until April 13 next.

There was no objection.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include an Army Day address by Lieutenant General Somervell before the Military Order of the World War at a recent Army Day dinner in Washington.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THOMASON)?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record on the subject of shipbuilding in the Great Lakes region and to include a statement or press release by the United States Maritime Commission.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York (Mr. BEITER)?

There was no objection.

## SYNTHETIC RUBBER

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York (Mr. BEITER)?

There was no objection.



Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, I am joining with Senator MURRAY, of Montana, in the sponsorship of legislation designed to speed up the extensive manufacture of synthetic rubber. My bill proposes the establishment of the United States Rubber Authority with full power and funds to acquire sites, to construct plants, and to operate facilities for the swift production of at least 400,000 tons of synthetic rubber.

Government ownership and operation of plants of this character is strictly a wartime expedient. Under normal circumstances I would not advocate it. But 30,000,000 motorists in America realize that conditions today are far from normal. The leaders of our war effort are keenly aware that rubber is now more precious than gold. Without an adequate supply of the commodity we are militarily bankrupt. We have no moral, military, or national right to jeopardize our armed forces nor essential civilian activity by short-sighted, ineffective methods for the provision of essential rubber volume.

Therefore it appears to me that we must face the realities of the current situation and deal forthrightly with them. Too many public and private agencies have been dwelling in the land of make-believe, gambling not upon our strength but upon the weakness and compassion of our real and potential enemies. Now we must necessarily rely on our own strength and upon our own ability to produce.

I would be satisfied to further subsidize private production, but, according to Mr. Jones' reasoning, we have about tapped the immediate extent of that source. Because I strongly feel that we cannot tamper with this emergency, I see no other swift, workable means for maximum production in synthetic rubber than in making it the Federal Government's responsibility.

I doubt if anyone will challenge the effectiveness of the plan proposed in my bill. If private companies are not equal to the task of vastly increased synthetic-rubber production—and it appears they are not—then it is plainly the Government's obligation to do the job. My bill presents a practical method of doing the job and—most important—of getting it done quickly.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to extend my own remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, there is something very peculiar about the synthetic rubber situation in the United States. Washington has been filled with rumors and whisperings about the manipulation which was indulged in to prevent the establishment of a synthetic rubber industry in the United States. Usually the blame was laid by administration spokesmen on general conditions, although Department of Commerce Secretary Jesse Jones, who also is head of the Reconstruction Fi-

nance Corporation and of the R. F. C.-owned and controlled Rubber Reserve Company, was allowed to take the blame for a serious miscalculation, if not worse, which is now becoming apparent.

It has been reported in some circles in Washington that the real reason behind the lag in the establishment of synthetic rubber plants was that President Roosevelt did not want to offend the British and Dutch rubber interests. Also, that he wanted to encourage the establishment of a rubber-growing industry in some of the Latin American countries. It is also said that he, as well as Vice President HENRY A. WALLACE, did not want a new industry established under pressure of the war needs which after the war would want a high tariff.

William L. Batt, in testifying before the Truman defense investigating committee recently, disclosed that the synthetic-rubber program had been torpedoed in some way under Jones' management. This Mr. Jones denies. He did admit, however, in testifying before the Truman committee, that the British-Dutch combine had blocked the efforts of the United States to build up a larger stock pile of natural rubber although it had been selling rubber to the Japs up to the time of the Pearl Harbor attack.

It is important to the American people that the record be kept straight in this regard, because it is so similar to the domestic sugar situation. It will be recalled that in spite of the most earnest warnings on the part of those who best knew the sugar situation that the advent of a general war would create a sugar shortage in the United States, both the President and the then Secretary of Agriculture, HENRY A. WALLACE, favored a reduction rather than an increase in the sugar-producing facilities of the United States. Many sugar companies were killed off by the adroit use of the quotas.

More than a year ago in these comments it was pointed out that synthetic rubber—strictly speaking of a natural rubber substitute—superior to the natural rubber itself could readily be manufactured from alcohol. It was pointed out that the alcohol for the production of this rubber could be made in alcohol plants from surplus corn, wheat, even the waste materials on the farm. Without going too deeply into the chemistry, the process was to redistill alcohol over a catalyst of aluminum into a chemical called butadiene. The butadiene, plus another chemical called styrene, polymerizes into this rubber substitute.

It was also pointed out that in quantities this rubber could be produced to sell for about the price of natural rubber. Its qualities were such, however, as to make it of vastly greater durability and utility than the natural-rubber product.

It was foreseen by many authorities as long as 2 years ago that there would be a rubber shortage in this country in the event of war, and that such a rubber shortage would come along with a sugar shortage. In spite of these warnings the administration opposed the establishment of alcohol plants for the purpose of producing alcohol for power, combined with gasoline in internal-combus-

tion motors, and also for this rubber substitute.

The result of that mistaken and blind policy of opposition is that the American people are now confronted with a shortage of three materials essential to American life, not one of which they need to have suffered if the administration had listened to those who knew the situation. One is a shortage of gasoline. Fuel alcohol can be produced in quantities at a comparatively low price to be combined with gasoline. Enough alcohol could have been produced to have prevented any gasoline shortage. A second shortage is that of rubber tires, which could have been entirely prevented by foresight on the part of the administration if it had given encouragement to the establishment of these alcohol plants to produce the alcohol necessary for conversion into rubber substitutes. The third is the sugar shortage. The American people have been told that part of their available sugar has already been used to produce alcohol. Surplus corn and surplus wheat, in the amount of more than a billion bushels, are still overshadowing the American farmer's market, and costing the Government, and through the Government the taxpayers, a lot of money when that corn and wheat could have been used in the manufacture of alcohol, thereby releasing the supply of sugar for use as such.

Instead of that the administration closed its eyes to the dangers that everyone else saw inherent in any war situation. The people are today paying the penalty for that. All through this entire investigation there is a singular effort, apparently, by spokesmen of the administration, including Mr. Jones, to discuss frankly the reason why the administration for years refused to assist in the establishment of alcohol plants, synthetic-rubber plants, rubber-substitute plants, and an expansion of the sugar industry.

It is devoutly to be hoped that this situation will be remedied forthwith, because this may be a long war.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include a letter written on the subject of silver.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE]?

There was no objection.

#### COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Military Affairs of the House may be permitted to sit during the sessions of the House the coming week.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY]?

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include an article from Southern California Business, published by the Los

Angeles Chamber of Commerce, entitled "Liberate America's Great Strength."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. LELAND M. FORD]? There was no objection.

#### THE PLAIN TRUTH ABOUT THE WAR

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an item from the Santa Monica Evening Outlook.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. LELAND M. FORD]? There was no objection.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting an editorial from the Santa Monica Evening Outlook, dated April 4, 1942, entitled "The Plain Truth About the War."

This is an excellent editorial, written without heat or destructive criticism, but dealing in some plain facts that all ought to know, and certainly is pertinent to our war program.

It should be noted, for instance, that Congress has appropriated ninety billion for the Army, of which twelve billion has been expended to date; forty-three billion for the Navy, of which only six billion has been spent; and for lend-lease, eighteen and one-half billion, out of which less than two billion has gone forward to our Allies. The Maritime Commission has been voted six and one-half billion, of which only three hundred and three million has been spent.

The editorial reviews the over-all plan, and I think properly so. It does it in a very calm, decent, American, factual way. I think Congress would do well to do this very thing itself, even if we have to set up a committee whose duty it would be simply to watch how the over-all plan is working, how appropriations are being translated into commodities for our war program, make constructive suggestions on progress and accomplishment, without political animosity, and furnish much needed information to Congress in general, using as its main idea, constructive cooperation toward the end of full and quick accomplishment of our war plans.

It will not avail us very much to fulfill our program in 1943 if we lose in 1942.

[From the Santa Monica Evening Outlook of April 4, 1942]

#### PLAIN TRUTHS ABOUT THE WAR

The news from the Russian war front, where Germany appears to have begun her spring campaign in the Ukraine and the Crimea, is hopeful but not reassuring.

The news from Burma where the Japanese Army is driving toward the invasion of India, is disturbing and serious.

Here in America, where we have undertaken both the tremendous task of supplying our allies with war equipment and the adequate defense of our own territory, our industrial war output is lacking in the volume which war's exigencies demand. That, too, is not good news.

The American people are beginning to realize this. They had felt assurance when Congress quickly and gladly made the vast appropriations that had been asked by the President. Congress did its part in making

unprecedented funds available for the war. But the executive departments of the Government have not crystallized industry into war production as rapidly as the funds granted by Congress led the public to hope for and expect.

A few figures are instructive. There is available, or before Congress, appropriations for the Army that total \$90,000,000,000. The actual amount spent to date is about \$12,000,000,000.

For the Navy \$43,000,000,000 are available or in process of appropriation. Of this amount only \$6,000,000,000 have been spent.

Lend-lease has been voted, or soon will be voted, \$18,500,000,000. Of this, according to the President's reports to Congress, less than \$2,000,000,000 has gone to our allies, and a considerable part of this was agricultural products, not guns, planes, or munitions.

The Maritime Commission, which is entrusted with the task of building ships to carry our Army and its equipment and supplies to the battlefronts and to furnish the Navy with the many supply ships it requires, has been voted \$6,500,000,000. The actual production of ships to date has caused an outlay of only \$303,000,000.

These outlays are increasing greatly now and will continue to do so. But the figures measure what has been done to date.

This has been due to several causes, the primary one being the time required to build and equip factories. There was also a failure in the executive departments at Washington, from the President down, to realize the magnitude of the task we had set ourselves. For example, we permitted the manufacture of automobiles to continue for months that should have been employed in retooling the plants for war production.

In saying this we do not wish to be critical or fault-finding. It is important, however, that the public know the facts.

The reports from the Axis countries, which may not be accepted unreservedly, indicate that the war production in Germany, Japan, and Italy, and the conquered countries were the equivalent in 1941 to what would cost \$45,000,000,000 in America. Our production was less than thirteen billions. To this is to be added England's output and that of Russia.

Apparently Washington has been satisfied with plans that would bring our maximum war effort in 1943. Now it appears that this year, 1942, may be the crucial one. Whether it is or not, it is clear that billions voted by Congress will not win the war unless they go into war production quickly and efficiently.

This calls for a tremendous expansion of manpower in war industry. It will require many more restrictions, probably, on goods for civilian use. Last year approximately 5,600,000 workers were employed in war production. Director Donald Nelson of War Production Board says we must produce \$40,000,000,000 of war equipment and supplies this year—more than three times last year's output.

This means that 10,000,000 more persons must be trained and put to work in war industry. At the same time we must draft 2,000,000 or 3,000,000 more men for the Army and Navy and their air corps.

This is a prodigious undertaking. It calls for the utmost effort from every American. Without this war production the Axis may win this war, and liberty in America will be lost as it has been in France.

We say this in all seriousness. The American people have never faced a graver peril or been called upon to make greater effort or more serious sacrifice.

We are making notable progress in airplane and tank production. We are far short of our needs in shipbuilding and in many other respects. It is no time for complacency or for shirking. This year may be decisive in this war. What America produces in every

kind of war supply and equipment may turn the tide our way on the great battlefronts.

Washington knows this but fails to appreciate that the American people also understand it and are ready to respond loyally to every demand that may be made on them.

What Washington needs to realize is that if there is failure it will be due to official delay or hesitancy and not to any lack of spirit or self-sacrificing patriotism. Today the American people stand ready to do their part; they rightly ask vigorous, driving, intelligent leadership.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. HOPE asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial relative to the W. P. A. in Carter County Okla.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTWRIGHT]? There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement which I made before the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SMITH]? There was no objection.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, April 16, 1942 a week from today, at the conclusion of the legislative program for the day I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SMITH]? There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS]? There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include certain excerpts from committee reports.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS]? There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by Capt. Joseph K. Carson, Oregon Department Commander of the American Legion, on the subject Why the Legion Fought for Strong United States Defense.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon? There was no objection.



# PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the legislative program today, and following any other special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record on the subject on which I spoke just a moment ago, synthetic rubber.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

# PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day, and following any other special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEYER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEYER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, my office has been swamped with correspondence on the subject of nondefense economy within the past few weeks. This is as it should be, because I believe that, more now than ever before, the public should be awakened to the vital necessity of rigid economy in Government, elimination of all nonessential activities, and concentration of all our resources, financial and otherwise, in an all-out effort to win this war with the least possible sacrifice of the lives and blood of our people.

I am proud of my record on the subject of nondefense economy. I believe that the people of the Fourth Congressional District of Maryland approve this record. It would be fair to state that it is a record which goes back as far as, if not actually antedating, that of any Member of Congress—House or Senate.

My record on this subject is perfectly clear and has long since been established. It has been demonstrated both by words and actions. In fact, my efforts on behalf of nondefense economy resulted in the following statements which were published in the Washington press on Sunday, December 7, 1941, the very day of the attack on Pearl Harbor.

"But to those on Capitol Hill, who have watched his quiet, lone-wolf attention to business, he has definitely done a good job. He has been not only the people's friend but

the taxpayers' friend. He is consistently penny-conscious.

"Slowly the story is getting around the Fourth District as to how Congressman MEYER has prevented the squandering of Federal funds.

"One of the most notable economy moves was MEYER's investigation of Coast Guard officers' housing at the Curtis Bay Coast Guard depot. MEYER heard that a lot of money was being spent and asked Rear Admiral R. R. Waesche about it. The Coast Guard commander sent back plans for the new housing project, and when MEYER broke them into details he found that each Coast Guard officer would be housed in a palatial mansion averaging \$20,000 apiece.

"As a result of MEYER's probing, the Coast Guard has modified its housing project in line with more economical standards.

"Last spring MEYER was invited to go along on a 2-months' junket to the Pacific coast to survey defense housing by the Public Buildings and Grounds Committee, of which he is a member. But he told his committee colleagues that 2 months was too long to take off; also, that he felt the most typical and interesting housing plans in the country were right in Maryland. When the committee came back from its jaunt he literally dragged them across the State line and proved it.

"Last spring MEYER took the floor in demanding a cut of nondefense expenditures. Today the White House itself is urging similar stringent economies."

Not only have I fought for and voted for nondefense economy during my entire term of office, but so far back as Tuesday, May 20, 1941, almost a year ago, I had occasion to predict to the House that this subject was becoming increasingly important. I refer to the following speech:

Mr. MEYER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, last week, when the House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4590) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, I felt constrained to support a number of amendments offered, even though I found myself to be the sole majority Member voting with the minority side of the House. This was, to me, a new and not altogether pleasant experience, but since then I have heard from many majority Members who feel that my reasons for so doing were sound. A teller vote was called for on two of the amendments offered which were designed to effect economies in the routine departments of Government, and, although rejected, the teller vote in one stood—yeas 66, nays 79; and in the other—yeas 73, nays 79; indicating that there is a strong sentiment for retrenchment. After the defeat of each amendment designed to reduce expenditures, I voted again with the minority party to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with the recommendation that the committee reduce the bill \$21,469,245.61 from the various items, with the exception of those items specified in hearings as national defense.

My reason for taking this position is based on the certain knowledge that all expenditures not directly connected with defense should be curtailed as much as possible in order that the entire resources of the Nation may be concentrated on the job at hand. I believe we are united as to the policy of building a strong defense against any possible aggression and that we are united in the belief that we should finance this program as far as is practicable on a pay-as-you-go basis. I believe that every individual and

every business in the country is willing to pay a fair share of the additional tax burden that will be necessary. However, it must be remembered that our peacetime budget and tax load over the last 10 years has been the largest in the history of the country, and it is essential that this staggering cost be apportioned in an equitable manner and the burden on our citizens eased as much as possible so that it will not of itself hamper the program of defense; and it is imperative, to my mind, that spending for nondefense needs be reduced in an effort to make it possible to meet this stupendous obligation. It must also be kept in mind that mere designation as a defense measure does not make it such. This is the case with the St. Lawrence seaway project, which was defeated on its merits, but is now being urged upon us as a necessity to national defense.

It occurred to me that there was no better place to begin economizing than with this appropriation bill which provided for an increase of approximately \$21,500,000 over the previous year for the use of the Department of the Interior, and, while the effort was entirely unsuccessful, I do feel from present indications that drastic moves for economy are forthcoming, and urge that we face in a very real and active way the necessity for rigid economy in unessential nondefense activities as a vital part of the national defense program.

It has been my policy during the emergency to lend my support to those measures which tend to strengthen our country economically and build up its defenses and to oppose any reckless pouring out of money on nondefense measures.

That this subject of unessential nondefense economy is very much alive is evidenced by recent editorials in many leading newspapers and periodicals.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Baltimore Evening Sun of May 16, 1941, which I am now filing, and I hope it will have the attention of the membership.

[From the Baltimore Evening Sun of May 16, 1941]

## A SHAKE-UP IS NEEDED IN THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

"It would be a tragic error to assume that we can expand our defense production on a colossal scale and still go our usual ways, whether as a government or as individuals. It would be folly to assume that we can continue to spend now for nondefense needs as we did in normal times."—Secretary of the Treasury Henry Morgenthau.

On Wednesday the House of Representatives, asked to institute economies, voted to separate Dr. Ruth Gruber, alleged Communist, from the pay roll of the Department of the Interior. This would be a \$5,000 saving. At the same time, however, the House approved and sent to the Senate a bill to appropriate \$177,027,078 for the use of the Department of the Interior, which would be \$21,477,345 more than the current year's appropriation.

This is fantastic. The Department of the Interior provides, in its vast, amorphous, catch-all roominess, a convenient location for countless unessential, nondefense groups and projects. The Department is a congeries of divisions, bureaus, boards, administrations, services, branches, subbranches, commissions, and committees. Merely to list them in close, fine print requires page after page of the Congressional Directory. Nobody, not even Mr. Ickes himself, knows everything that goes on in this grab bag Department, but everyone knows that here is an opportunity to avoid the tragic error of which Mr. Morgenthau spoke when he warned

against spending for unessential nondefense purposes.

The Nation faces a probable public debt of \$90,000,000,000. It faces a future darker and more uncertain than at any time since Washington first took the oath of office. Yet, with national safety at stake, the House of Representatives goes its usual way and votes to add \$21,000,000 more to the taxpayers' burden. And for a Department full of unessential, nondefense projects.

My record on nondefense economy is augmented by the fact that I have not taken time out to play politics, but have concentrated all my energy and time on my office and the serious problems incident to winning the war. This is no time to play politics. It is a luxury in which I cannot indulge. I have but one job and that job is to attend to the public business. I have attended every session of Congress and have answered every roll call. In my opinion, a public office is truly a public trust.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a statement from the Washington press of December 7.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the remarks of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL] today I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the remarks of the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] today I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein two short newspaper articles relating to the work of the Farm Security Administration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the Missouri Farm Bureau News under date of April 1, 1942.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the Seattle Post-Intelligencer.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein some newspaper editorials.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Commissioner from Puerto Rico?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the majority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] may be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an Easter message by William Cardinal O'Connell, of Boston.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of regimentation, priorities, allocations, and so forth.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

#### SHIPBUILDING FACILITIES ON THE GREAT LAKES

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, a news item in today's paper carries a lot of interesting information about what the automobile industry is now doing in Detroit in the war-production program. In its concluding paragraph, after describing the war materials that are being turned out there, it states:

Speed up the building of ships, so that we can get our planes and tanks and guns into the hands of our fighting men on all the far-flung fronts of this war.

Mr. Speaker, months and months ago we pointed out to administration leaders the need for the decentralization of industry so that war industries could be located in the Midwest. As part of that program we pointed out the shipbuilding facilities on the Great Lakes. I am referring particularly to Lake Superior, but I do not exclude the other Great Lakes. The Great Lakes have shipyards, they have shipbuilding facilities. I call attention at this time to these facilities because I believe some of the administration leaders and some of the men in charge of that program are overlooking the possibilities.

It is true that large boats cannot be constructed in the Great Lakes shipyards because we made a mistake a long time ago in not deepening the St. Lawrence seaway channel to a 27-foot depth. The seaway channel, at the present time, is only 14 feet in depth, and this makes

necessary the construction of a smaller type of vessel in the yards on the Great Lakes. Recent newspaper items indicate a shipbuilding program and increased activity in shipyards located on the Atlantic seaboard and on the western coast.

Congress should authorize the St. Lawrence seaway project at once so that oceangoing boats could travel in a 27-foot channel. Such boats could then be built in the shipyards on the Great Lakes.

I also want to point out that at the present time there is plenty of skilled labor available in the Midwest, and it is to the economic advantage of this country to keep such labor there and to give the employment. This is perhaps just another reason why the Congress should act favorably on the St. Lawrence seaway project. However, until such action is taken, I want to direct attention to the fact that the Great Lakes still have shipbuilding facilities and that the Government ought to construct the smaller craft at the shipyards now available in the Great Lake ports.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, during the past 2 months I have received numerous letters from my constituents urging me to vote for legislation to outlaw strikes on national defense projects. I have also received numerous letters asking that the 40-hour-week law be amended so that no worker would be entitled to time and a half pay after working 40 hours on a national defense project.

I know that the people of my district are well aware of the fact that I have and will continue to vote to repeal any law which has a tendency to retard the work in defense industries. As far back as April 15, 1941, on the floor of this House, I expressed my sentiment on the strike situation existing in national defense industries; therefore there should be no doubt in any of my constituents' minds as to my position on matters of this nature.

We voted for the so-called Smith bill December 3, 1941, 4 days before the Pearl Harbor incident, and this bill is now pending before the Senate. I am certain that if the Senate will pass the Smith labor bill, the people of this country will consider this a direct demand to the President and the executive departments to correct the labor situation and do away with the 40-hour-week program for the duration of the war. We all know that the President with his wartime power has full authority to correct this situation without an act of Congress.

I personally am not in a position to know whether strikes and other irregularities of this nature have caused delays in manufacturing war materials. I am here to represent the people of the Sixth District of South Carolina, and it seems to me that the majority of them are in



favor of passing some antistrike legislation for the duration of the war, and they are anxious to have the 40-hour-week law repealed for the duration. I shall strive to see that their wishes are granted by continuing to assist in every way possible in having our war program expedited.

I have cast my vote for the benefit of labor many times during the past few years; however, I believe that labor, the industrial leaders, and every other person enjoying the benefits granted by the Constitution of this country should forget their personal gains and all get behind the wheel and push in an effort to help the President bear the burden which rests upon his shoulders at this time.

A majority of the labor legislation now on the statute books was enacted before I became a Member of Congress, and it is my understanding that this legislation was passed during the depression and had as its purpose spreading the work in the different industries as much as possible so that every person would have at least an opportunity to work 5 8-hour days a week.

Labor is entitled to its fair share of profit and authority, but no more. Industry is entitled to its fair share of profit and authority, but no more. The American people want this, but they also want and demand that production machinery must not be stopped by strikes or any other interference. I fully realize that the rights of labor have not always been respected by capital. On the other hand, I am aware of the fact that labor must sacrifice along with all other American groups in a common effort to win this war. The winning of this war is our first objective, and we can win only by outstripping the Axis Powers in producing more planes and tanks.

Mr. Speaker, I am certain that the labor unions and labor in my district are as patriotic as any other group of people in the United States, and they would be among the last people in these United States to retard our war effort. I wish that the laborers and people as a whole throughout the United States were as patriotic as our people in South Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, in defense of the Congress, may I say that by legislation we have removed all the restrictions as to the number of planes, tanks, ships, and other necessary war equipment we may build, and have authorized the War and Navy Departments to proceed with only the sky as a limit. We have appropriated billions of dollars for this purpose, and it is certainly not the fault of Congress if these billions have not been transformed into tanks and guns. This job lies at the doorsteps of the President, our Commander in Chief, and, from the best information I can get, he is doing a good job and leading us toward victory.

I am certain that the Members of the House of Representatives have received a great deal of criticism that they do not deserve, as we have long since passed legislation which is now being advocated by the majority of the people of my district.

The greatest aid our people can give our Commander in Chief at the present time is to try to keep unfounded rumors from being spread among the masses, who are already frantic and disturbed over the few reverses we have received at the hands of our enemies. It is true that we have lost some territory; however, our casualty list is relatively small compared to that of our enemy. We will win this war, and at the same time we want to save the lives of as many of our fine young men as possible. Therefore I hope that our people must and will be patient and let our Commander in Chief and his leaders in the Army and Navy lead us in this war.

America is not accustomed to defeat, and America will not be defeated unless she defeats herself. This is the time when every American should manifest his patriotic spirit to its deepest depths. Our people throughout the United States can render a wonderful service by assisting our Government officials in stamping out false rumors being spread by Hitler's propaganda agents.

I know that when a peace-loving people are thoroughly aroused and fully realize the seriousness of the situation confronting them they will take matters in their own hands and it will not be left up to the Government officials to stop certain newspaper editors, radio commentators, and columnists from making wild guesses and statements which are calculated to lead the people of this country into a state of confusion.

I have spent practically every day in my office during the past 3 years in an effort to assist in preparing our country for the emergency with which it is confronted today, and since war was declared I have used every ounce of energy that I have in trying to expedite the building of war materials and to bring this war to a speedy, successful end. I have not had time to visit the people of my district as it is absolutely impossible to properly carry on one's work as a Congressman while Congress is in session and, at the same time, visit the people of one's district 500 miles distant. I know of nothing that would give me more pleasure than to spend several months traveling around over my district; however, I know that this would not be of any assistance to our President in carrying the war program to a successful end.

Mr. Speaker, the records will prove that I have not cast a single vote during the past year with the idea of advancing my political career, and it is my sincere hope that the people of our country will adjourn politics until this war is over. Labor and industrial leaders should not take advantage of this crisis to advance their personal interests and enrich themselves while our brothers, sons, and loved ones are dying on the battle fronts.

#### CONSTRUCTION OF NATIONAL DEFENSE HIGHWAYS

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

#### ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATION FOR ACCESS ROADS

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce that I have today introduced a bill (H. R. 6908) to authorize appropriation of an additional \$100,000,000 for construction and improvement of access roads to military and naval reservations, to war industries, and to sources of strategic raw materials.

The bill is recommended by the Acting Administrator of the Federal Works Agency, with the approval of the President.

It would simply amend section 6 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941, approved November 19, 1941, Public Law No. 295, by striking out the figure "\$150,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof the figure "\$250,000,000."

Section 6 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941 provides as follows:

Access roads: The Commissioner of Public Roads is authorized to provide for the construction and improvement of access roads (including bridges, tubes, and tunnels thereon) to military and naval reservations to defense industries and defense industry sites, and to the sources of raw materials, when such roads are certified to the Federal Works Administrator as important to the national defense by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, and for replacing existing highways and highway connections that are shut off from general public use by necessary closures or restrictions at military and naval reservations and defense industry sites. The acquisition of new or additional rights-of-way necessary for such projects may, to the extent determined by the Federal Works Administrator, be included as part of the construction of such projects, and Federal funds shall be available to pay the cost of such acquisition. For carrying out the purpose of this section there is hereby authorized to be appropriated during the continuance of the emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941, the sum of \$150,000,000, which shall be available, without regard to apportionment among the several States, for paying all or any part of the cost thereof: *Provided, however*, That in determining the expenditure of the funds under this section due consideration shall be given to projects for such roads in States which have heretofore expended their own funds for the immediate construction of roads and highways deemed essential to the national defense, which roads and highways, but for the action of such States, would be properly considered for construction with Federal funds under the provisions of this section.

My understanding is that the \$150,000,000 originally authorized for construction of access roads to centers of war activity has been expended or obligated, and that in our expanding war program at least \$100,000,000 in addition will be required for such facilities.

Specific locations or projects, of course, are not considered by the Congress. Details of proposed construction are worked out by officials of the Army or Navy, in cooperation with the various State highway departments and the Public Roads Administration.

Many Members will recall that on June 21, 1940, President Roosevelt directed the

Public Roads Administration of the Federal Works Agency to "make a survey of our highway facilities from the viewpoint of national defense" and suggested that "particular attention be paid to the strength of bridges, the width of strategic roads, adequacy of ingress to and egress from urban centers, and the servicing of existing and proposed Army, naval, and air bases."

It is thus seen that nearly 2 years ago the President foresaw the important relationship of adequate highway transportation facilities to our national defense program.

That serviceable highways are a vital war necessity is the plain implication of hundreds of reports on the use of highways by war industries and their workers. These reports make it clear that many industries are as dependent as a modern army on motor vehicles.

For example, the Ford bomber plant at Ypsilanti, Mich., probably will employ more than 50,000 people this year, and it is expected they will travel to work in 22,000 private cars. Plant officials expect to get 25 percent of their necessary raw materials by motortruck, 75 percent by rail. Outgoing, the products of the plant will probably move 60 percent by truck, 40 percent by air.

A recent survey shows that 95 percent of the 7,000 employees of the Hudson Navy Arsenal in Detroit are brought to their work by highway transportation. The arsenal gets 75 percent of its raw materials by truck, 25 percent by rail, and the finished product is transported by the two means in about the same proportion.

These are typical examples of the situation at thousands of centers of our war activity. Clearly the highways are playing a vital role in our war effort.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after other special orders previously granted I may address the House today for 15 minutes on the subject of magnesium.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and to include therein certain protests against the proposed tax on the telephone pension fund.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein an editorial from the Shenandoah Sentinel on soil conservation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

#### SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, every letter I receive convinces me that the American people, almost without exception, are willing and anxious to do everything within their power to bring our war production to maximum efficiency and to supply our soldiers fighting at the front with every weapon and all equipment necessary to enable them to defeat our enemies. They are willing to sacrifice and go without not only the luxuries to which we have been accustomed but many of the necessities of life. Our Government has asked them to go without sugar, tires, gasoline, and many other daily necessities which have become a part of the very fabric of our industrial and social life. Our people are willing to do this to win the war and save our country and to save our lives. They are not willing, however, and I am not willing, to permit the material and supplies and the war funds raised from high taxes and bond sales to be frittered away in graft, excessive profits, furbelows, and boondoggling.

Many of us here in the Congress have been uncovering by every effort possible and available to us the waste and useless expenditures of war appropriations. We uncovered a striking example recently where a concern with \$100,000 invested has been awarded \$58,000,000 in war contracts. It was charging the Government \$600 for an airplane starter which cost the firm only \$272 to produce. In order to cover up these huge excessive profits this concern boosted the salary of the president from \$25,000 to \$145,845 in 1941 and paid to the personal secretary of the president, a woman holding a minor position, \$39,356 for 1941, and has paid her \$18,295 in the first 10 weeks of 1942. Another employee—an assistant controller—was given work with the firm last November for \$3,600 a year. Six weeks later he was paid by this concern a bonus of \$10,000, which he admitted in his testimony before the congressional committee that he did not earn.

The Congress has placed the power to prosecute the war in the hands of the Commander in Chief and the various departments charged with the responsibility of spending the moneys appropriated and contracting for the munitions and supplies necessary to prosecute the war. The Congress cannot supervise or attend to the detailed operations in carrying out this huge enterprise. For my own part, I demand that those who have been given this responsibility eliminate completely these excessive profits and wasting of public funds. If we are to succeed in this enterprise and win the war, those in charge of the program must realize once and for all that the American people will not stand for the weakening of our efforts, the slowing down of war production, and the wasting of public funds by such reprehensible conduct as the one to which I have alluded. It should not be assumed, however, that this contract to which I have referred is a fair sample of what is going on in the furnishing of our war supplies and material. I am glad to say that most of our citizens who are contracting with the Government are honest and seeking to do a good job and at a reasonable profit,

and they should not be censored by the reason of what is being done by some of these chiselers and dishonest contractors who are seeking to mulct the Government.

Anyone who slows down our war production and our war efforts or impedes our progress toward victory, either by excessive and dishonest profits or charges for war material, or by stoppage and slowing down of our efforts through excessive demands of any kind and from any source, whether it be capital, labor, or the public, is guilty of reprehensible conduct and is engaging in treasonable action against our Government.

The Congress has made it clear that so far as lies within its power it will not vote funds for boondoggling and carrying on in the guise of national defense activities which have no relation to defense. This attitude of Congress was brought particularly to the front in its clamping down on the activities of the Office of Civilian Defense. The employment of night club dancers and many others of similar attainments whose training and experience have not equipped them to occupy positions of authority in the defense of our civilian population has been banned by Congressional action. As a result there has been a promise that the whole Department of Civilian Defense will be revamped and all of the frills, cream puffs, dancing, and other frivolous activities completely eradicated. It now appears that there were literally dozens and perhaps hundreds of this type of employees on the pay roll of this particular activity, and in almost every instance no consideration was given to the fitness of the particular employee for the position he or she occupied, and the work to be performed had no bearing upon civilian defense. We in the Congress provide funds for the civilian defense in order to protect the civilian population against possible air raids and other attacks. There was no intention that the funds appropriated should be used for these boondoggling activities.

This stupendous task which we face has led many of us here in the Congress to demand that every dollar we are appropriating for all-out defense must be judiciously spent and a dollar's worth of equipment and defense secured for each dollar expended. Therefore, we demanded that the boondoggling and waste of Federal funds in war contracts cease. It has been clearly demonstrated that immense sums have been absolutely squandered and wasted in putting into effect our war program. Huge and unconscionable profits have been realized by some contractors and grossly excessive prices have been paid for materials and land, and leeches in the guise of brokers have been acting as go-betweens between the Government and contractors, and have been sucking the lifeblood of our Nation in seizing upon huge payments exacted in the guise of services rendered in bringing the Government and the contractors together. Such practices are un-American and little short of treason, and must be stopped.

The sooner we realize that we are fighting with our backs to the wall to save democracy and our own country and that



everyone must join in the effort with all his energy and resources if we are to win, and these frivolous peacetime activities and boondoggling expenditures must cease, the sooner the whole program will go forward and there will be complete unity behind the program. These practices unquestionably have curtailed defense bond sales, as disclosed by the receipts of the Secretary of the Treasury. The law recently enacted providing pensions for Congressmen has also added to confusion and unquestionably has been reflected in bond sales. I am strongly opposed to this bill, voted against it in 1939 and voted to repeal it.

Mr. Speaker, during my entire service in the Congress I have urged full preparedness so that we might be equipped completely with modern tools and munitions of warfare with which to defend ourselves in case we were attacked. The success of modern warfare depends almost entirely upon modern mechanized equipment on the land, on and under the water, and in the air. Unfortunately, when war broke upon us we were not fully prepared. Our fighting forces on the battle fronts have been compelled to meet the adversary at a great disadvantage. In almost every instance the enemy has been superior in force and equipment. We have been working feverishly in our great industrial plants, airplane factories, and shipyards to meet these deficiencies. We particularly need airplanes and ships. Fortunately, we are now beginning to see daylight, and these tools of war are coming out of our plants in ever-increasing numbers, and we can look forward to the day when we will gain superiority and then we can confidently expect a favorable turn in the fortunes of the war.

In the meantime, every American, regardless of his position or situation in life, must decide for himself what more he can do to bring about this superiority in fighting strength. Every decision each of us have to make must be measured by the yardstick, "Will it help win the war," not will it help me or will it bring greater returns to me or to my family, or will it advance my personal interests, or will it help me politically, but the only consideration is, "Will it help win the war." If we fail in this, we fail in all. Unless we win, America is doomed. Let us all work together full speed and win. Stop graft, waste, and delays.

In the battle of Bataan, the Japanese painted themselves green and hid in the trees in the jungle and unobserved carried on their sniping, picking off American soldiers here and there. The same tactics have been used in every country during this titanic struggle but in a different way. The fifth columnists infiltrated into France, Belgium, Holland, and all the countries overrun by the Nazis. Here in America there are individuals filling this same role. They may not be painted green or hid in tree-tops, but they stand in the market places, in the shops, in the homes, and on the streets and snipe at the efforts being made by the administration and those who are charged with the responsibility of carrying on the war and the Congress which under the Constitution must provide the means for the prosecution of the

war. Many of them for purely personal and selfish reasons to advance their own interests or gain a political job seek to undermine the war program and render ineffective those charged with the responsibility of the prosecution of the war in the executive and the legislative departments of our Government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] for 15 minutes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill to amend section 32 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act. The effect of the amendment is to authorize the appropriation of funds, other than 30 percent of the customs receipts, for the purposes for which section 32 money has heretofore been authorized to be expended.

When the agricultural appropriation bill passed the House I offered an amendment, the design and purpose of which was to provide sufficient funds so that we might have a school-lunch program for the undernourished children of America, which would be commensurate with the need and so we would be in a position to take care of any crop surplus situations that may arise in connection with the very great expansion of our farm production called for by the food-for-freedom program. The amendment was stricken out on a point of order. This piece of legislation which I am introducing today would leave the Congress in a position, which it is not now in to decide what amount it felt was necessary to be had for the purposes of commodity distribution, the stamp plan, the school-lunch program, and the program of supporting farm prices against the possibility of surpluses destroying that price structure. It would remove all that program from complete dependence which it now has upon 30 percent of customs receipts, however much that may be.

America is at war. She is in the very middle of the only total war in all history.

Realization of all that means, of the terrible magnitude of the task that lies ahead of us, of the deprivation and suffering to be endured—all these are being borne in upon our people.

When the course of a people's destiny changes so drastically as has that of America since Pearl Harbor it is inevitable that there will be confusion in our minds. Some things we have struggled hard to gain must, for the time being, be given up. Special group interests must universally give way to the common defense and general welfare, to use the words of the Constitution. The times demand not a generally higher standard of living to make possible the employment of all but rather a reduction in consumption—especially of certain types of goods—in order that we may produce more tanks and planes and ships and guns.

But with it all we cannot, if we would have real victory in the end, forget that tanks and planes and ships and guns are of no avail without men. Nor are men likely to gain victory unless they and the nation behind them are driven by great, simple, and essentially religious ideals. Especially is this true of America. We

are a people slow to wrath. We are not an imperialistic nation. We are still, on the whole, rather far from the scenes of actual combat. Yet we must be moved by a spirit that is as consecrated and determined as that which impels a man to fight for his very home when it is under direct attack.

The cause of democracy, moreover, must not be allowed to be a generalized and nebulous thing. It must have substance—it must mean to people certain very practical things which they can understand. Ideals of our common life together must be taking shape even as we fight the war. For at bottom this war is more than military conflict. It is a world-wide battle between two diametrically opposite philosophies of life and government. The battle is for the allegiance of people around the world. Ultimately there is no question of a doubt that that side will win which demonstrates to the millions of human beings in the world that in the highest and best sense it deserves to win.

What finer demonstration of the fact that America deserves to win could be given than this. If while we turn away frivolity and luxury and group selfishness and while we devote all our fat and some of our sinew to the war we at the same time devote ourselves to the realization of this simple ideal: "There shall be no undernourished, no hungry school child in all the United States."

#### WHAT GENERAL HERSHEY SAID

And just in case anyone might contend that this proposal of mine is not of importance to winning the war, I want to call attention to a statement of General Hershey, Director of Selective Service before the National Nutrition Conference on May 27, 1941. Here is what he said:

It has been estimated that perhaps one-third of the men rejected (for physical unfitness) was due either directly or indirectly to nutritional deficiencies. In terms of men the Army today has been deprived of 150,000 men who should be able to do duty as soldiers. This is 15 percent of the total number which have been physically examined by the Selective Service System.

It is perhaps of little use to speculate on what should have been done by our schools, by parents, by health bodies, or by the Government. \* \* \* It is a condition we should recognize as dangerous, and which we should take immediate, positive, and vigorous measures to correct.

I heard the Surgeon General of the United States only the other night state that this school-lunch program has been the most basically helpful step in improving the health of the American people that has been taken by our Nation.

I know there are a lot of things we cannot do during this war. I know there are many things we must and should go without. I know that many expenditures of Government will have to be cut down, but I submit there is one basic policy we ought to pursue, and that is the policy of seeing to it that there shall be no malnutrition in our country at the present time, at least among the children. If there is one thing most necessary to the strength of our Nation, most helpful in preventing tuberculosis and other diseases, it is a good diet for our children.

#### HOW MANY UNDERNOURISHED SCHOOL CHILDREN DO WE HAVE?

There are undernourished children among the generation of tomorrow in our country. There are about 9,000,000 of them. This is just 9,000,000 more than there ought to be and 9,000,000 more than there need to be. For an expenditure of between \$60,000,000 and \$90,000,000 of Federal funds we can make it true that there will not be one. The exact determination of the actual number of undernourished or malnourished school children in the United States is of course not easy. Tests of nutritional status involve the checking of a great many data, and even an exhaustive physical test sometimes yields questionable results.

However, what constitutes an adequate diet is very well known, and a number of studies on the adequacy of diets have been made. One of the most significant is the Nation-wide survey conducted by the Bureau of Home Economics of the Department of Agriculture in 1935-36. It was found at this time that 27 percent of the families in the country had good diets, 38 percent had fair diets, and 35 percent had poor diets. A diet providing a wide margin of safety above nutritional requirements was classified as good; that providing a narrow margin, fair; and that deficient in the things necessary for vigor, normal development, and health, was called poor.

As would be expected, dietary conditions were particularly bad among low-income families. Of the families spending about \$1.75 per person per week for food, 75 percent had poor diets. At the time of the study, \$1.75 per person per week was the average food expenditure for nonrelief families in the \$500-\$1,000 annual income class, and, of course, was well above the average for relief families. In 1936, 47 percent of all American families had incomes of less than \$1,000. Of course, that situation is somewhat improved now—but not as much, I fear, as we would like to believe. That low-income families have more than the average number of children is well known. And so it is evident that the 35 percent of the families that have had inadequate diets, include much more than 35 percent of the children.

The National Resources Committee's report, *Consumer Incomes in the United States—1935-36*—shows that 32 percent of all families in the United States had incomes of less than \$750 per year, and nearly half—47 percent—had incomes of less than \$1,000. Further reference to the Bureau of Home Economics study discussed above will establish a strong supposition that 75 percent of these low-income families had inadequate diets. Again, this indicates that more than one-third of the families in the country have inadequate diets because they cannot afford better diets.

A Bureau of Labor Statistics study of employed wage earners and clerical workers in 1935-36 showed that more than 40 percent of the children in this relatively favored group lived in families

whose incomes were below the level necessary to provide an adequate diet, as well as suitable housing, clothing, and medical care. And, of course, families in these circumstances are going to have an inadequate diet. It is unreasonable to expect families to budget for a suitable diet by falling below the maintenance level in all the other necessities of life.

What effect the rise in national income in the past few years has had on these figures cannot yet be determined, but it must be remembered that the rise in income has been accompanied by a rise in living costs. And for many people the rise in living costs has been greater than the increase in income. It is significant that as late as 1939 it was estimated that 19 percent of the children in the country were members of families on public relief rolls, and in December 1941, 9,700,000 people were dependent on some form of public relief for their living. If we add to these the families which under good standards would be eligible for relief, but are subsisting mainly on food from the Surplus Marketing Administration, and above all the millions of families who have never asked or received any relief, but which have an income of less than \$1,000 a year, it is readily apparent that the undernourished "one-third of a nation" is not an idle phrase.

Since the school population of the country is about 28,000,000, a realistic study of the above reports leads to the inevitable conclusion that upward of nine or ten million children of school age are denied an adequate diet simply because the family income does not permit it. And a very great percentage of these children live not in city slums but on the farms of the Nation themselves.

These are the children from which America's whole future strength must come. They are the ones that will inherit the world situation we are now creating. It will be no easy one. It is not only sound national policy but a matter of simple justice that we give them a fair and decent start.

#### SCHOOL-LUNCH PROGRAM

What then shall we do about it? Fortunately a method and program has already been tried out and found to be good. It is ready to our hand if we will take it and use it with the vigor it and the children of America deserve.

I am introducing today an amendment to section 32 of Public Law No. 320, to permit the Department of Agriculture to continue and expand its aid to school-lunch programs for undernourished children. That is the reason for this speech.

I do not know how well acquainted the Members are with the school-lunch programs for undernourished children. In December of 1941 the Department of Agriculture, through the Surplus Marketing Administration, helped feed approximately five and one-half million of the estimated 9,000,000 undernourished children in the United States. Over 80,000 schools operated lunch programs supported in part by commodities furnished by the Surplus Marketing Administration. About 75 percent of the

children received a complete hot meal; the other 25 percent got only cold lunches, sometimes only fruit juice.

I have seen, and will later present, some of the thousands of letters from teachers and parents in the files of the Surplus Marketing Administration testifying to the importance of the school-lunch program. Letters from teachers telling of children bringing to school only a piece of corn bread smeared with lard for their noon lunch, and frequently these children had come to school with no breakfast; of children who brought empty lunch pails to school, and at lunch time went to some secluded part of the school grounds so that their companions would not know they had no lunch; copies of letters from parents to teachers saying that the children had to work in the cottonfield that day, but that they would come to school at noon to get their regular lunch.

As you know, Public Law No. 320 was passed as an aid to agriculture. It provides, among other things, that the Secretary of Agriculture shall encourage the domestic consumption of agricultural commodities by getting them to persons in low-income groups. Under this legislation the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation and its successor, the Surplus Marketing Administration, have purchased agricultural commodities when a surplus situation threatened the price structure. There have been times when prompt action by this agency has been the one thing that has saved the markets for some farm commodities from complete demoralization.

One of the ways—and I personally think the most important one—in which the Surplus Marketing Administration has used these commodities is in the school-lunch program.

Briefly, the school-lunch program works this way: Commodities purchased by the Surplus Marketing Administration are allocated to State departments of welfare who, in turn, allocate them to schools which certify that they have undernourished children in attendance. Whatever commodities are available are allotted to schools on the basis of the number of undernourished children, and these children are given free lunches. At the same time, every effort is made to have all children in the school served the same food, so that there is no discrimination whatever between the paying and nonpaying children. Local sponsors of the program, who may be boards of education, parent-teacher associations, or other public-spirited civic groups furnish labor, equipment, and foods to supplement those furnished by the Surplus Marketing Administration. The children do not need to know, and in most cases probably do not know, that the Federal Government is giving them anything. There is just a lunch where there was none before—that is all.

Administration and management of the school-lunch program is left entirely to the local sponsor and the actual working out of it takes almost as many forms as there are schools participating. The



Surplus Marketing Administration and State departments of welfare exercise only nominal supervision over the program to make sure that the food is properly utilized, that it meets the greatest need it can, and that no child is treated or made to feel an object of charity or of governmental largess.

Up to now the distribution of these commodities to hungry children has depended entirely upon the surplus situation with respect to the commodities themselves and upon the chance that 30 percent of tariff receipts would be sufficient to carry on this and the other programs dependent on that money. At this time, because of the war and the increased demand for food products, commodities available on a strict surplus basis are limited in variety and quantity, and they will probably change rather drastically from time to time. The volume of imports, furthermore, is an altogether uncertain quantity and will undoubtedly be very small indeed for the next several years. I think, with the agricultural situation changing from day to day, and with the financial provision for section 32 work so very uncertain, it is time we amend this legislation so that funds in addition to tariff receipts can be appropriated, if necessary, to make possible these school lunches and to see that they meet the basic need of the children.

The Surplus Marketing Administration is now besieged by anxious teachers, parents, and interested people of every sort who fear that under the emergency program, Federal aid for school lunches will be curtailed or cut off completely. The tone of the letters leaves no doubt that lunch programs will have to be completely abandoned in many areas if this aid is denied.

Of course, the poorest communities, which are least able to do anything for themselves, will be the hardest hit.

I do not want to see this splendid work curtailed; rather, I think because of the war, we must expand it to the point that there is not one hungry child in the land. One of the four freedoms, for which we are fighting, is freedom from want. The farmers of America are being asked to produce not only enough food for America and her fighting forces but also enough for the people of many other lands as well. What can we say to millions of our own undernourished children if we take away from them their one decent meal a day?

#### WHAT OTHER NATIONS HAVE DONE

I would like to talk for a moment about nation school-lunch legislation in other countries. France, in 1882, made the establishment of school funds for meals and other extra-curricular activity mandatory upon communities. Free school lunches have also been supported by national legislation in Holland, Switzerland, Denmark, Finland, Austria, Belgium, and some other countries.

In Central and South America no less than 13 countries support free breakfast, lunch, and milk projects wholly or partly from federal funds.

In England, school lunches became a national issue upon the publication in 1902 of a statement that only two of every five men who wished to become soldiers in the Boer War were physically fit. This is similar to the experience of our own Selective Service officials, who found that of the first million men examined in the recent draft, 15 percent had to be rejected because of disabilities traceable to nutritional defects. A committee of Parliament found that "We have got to the point where we must face the question whether the logical culmination of free education is not free meals in some form or other, it being cruelty to force a child to go and learn what it has not the strength to learn." In 1906 the Provision of Meals Act put the feeding of undernourished children in the hands of local educational authorities. The legislation was not mandatory, but under this and following acts of Parliament the movement for free school lunches rapidly gained strength up to the beginning of the present war.

Now what has England done with school lunch under her war program? Has she abandoned it? No. In the midst of the greatest crisis in her history, and with the distribution of food severely restricted, England has gone ahead far more rapidly with her school-lunch program than ever before. England, of course has long since passed through the period we are now in and has already reached the inescapable conclusion that nothing is more vital to the defense effort than an adequately fed population. I understand the central government of England is now subsidizing milk for school children up to 100 percent, and school lunches up to 95 percent of the total cost, and the announced policy of the ministry of food is to expand school lunches until all the 5,000,000 elementary- and secondary-school children in the country are included. In addition school canteens are given larger allowances of the protective foods than are ordinary restaurants and cafes. If England with her shortage of food, can do this, should we, with our tremendous stocks of food, consider reducing the little help we are now giving this important work?

I do not see how we, with our tremendous production of food, can do less than England has done.

The United States has been slow to follow the lead of other countries in regard to school lunches—a means to national health and strength. A number of municipalities and private groups set up free and low-cost lunch programs in schools around the beginning of the century. However, it was not until the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation, as an adjunct of their surplus-disposal activities, made commodities available for lunches for undernourished school children, that Nation-wide interest in a school lunch program was aroused. There is still no national legislation or school lunches. Such legislation—legislation to establish a principle in our country—the principle of "no hungry children in America" is what I am offering and what I am talking about today.

#### WHAT MY BILL WILL DO

Because the Department of Agriculture's aid to school-lunch programs has depended upon the purchase of commodities that were actually in surplus, and because there has been no policy adopted and no assurance of financial support, its donations have been irregular and somewhat undependable. Local sponsors have frequently carried on under great difficulties, but they have carried on in most cases. However, if the Department of Agriculture should have to discontinue its aid, there is no doubt that much of this work will be given up.

Under the present legislation the Department may soon be handicapped in its prosecution of the school-lunch program by the rather vague language of Public Law No. 320 which has been interpreted to permit only commodities in surplus to be purchased for distribution to low-income groups, and which makes no provision for appropriations, aside from the 30 percent of customs receipts. Under the food-for-freedom program it is almost certain that local surplus situations will arise which will justify purchases by the Department of Agriculture under the present act. However, it may become very important, if a good school-lunch program is to be maintained, that limited supplemental purchases be made of commodities not in surplus. How, indeed, could food be better used than to supply really dietary needs of children? It is to meet this situation that I want to amend this legislation. The amendment will enable the Congress to establish the policy and principle of a sustained, orderly, and adequate school-lunch program to the end that Americans may proudly say, "There is being reared in our Nation the strongest, healthiest, most intelligent future race that the world has ever known."

#### AS A NECESSARY WAR MEASURE

I have mentioned before the importance of keeping school-lunch programs going from a nutritional and national welfare point of view. I would like now to mention their possible great importance as a measure of meeting war emergencies. If air raids come while children are in school, the children will in most cases have to stay in the building until the "all clear." What an immense morale builder a warm meal would be at a time like this is immediately apparent.

If evacuations become necessary, undoubtedly school buildings will be turned into evacuee shelters. In such a case, the importance of a feeding program already in operation cannot be overestimated.

The National Nutrition Committee and the Conference on Women's Activities in Civilian Defense have endorsed school-lunch programs as a defense measure.

#### HOW ABOUT OUR FARMERS?

And what about the farmers of America? While we do not anticipate any important agricultural surpluses during the period of the emergency, we should remember that when the war is over there is danger that our farmers will be in an even worse position than they were before we entered the war, unless we have

the will to prevent this. But if we have established it as a principle of our life that where children are hungry there we will see that food is sent them, the best of all possible outlets for distributing any surpluses will be readily available.

Local sponsors, teachers, parents, and school children are going to do everything they can to keep these programs going. We can help them immeasurably by permitting the Department of Agriculture to purchase and distribute the simple kinds of food that are necessary to supplement what local people can do to make sure that America's rising generation is prepared to meet tomorrow's world with strong bodies and vigorous minds.

**ESTIMATED COST OF AN ADEQUATE SCHOOL-LUNCH PROGRAM AND SCHOOL-MILK PROGRAM SERVING 9,000,000 CHILDREN**

It has been carefully estimated that a school-lunch program giving consideration to a variety of foodstuffs which would substantially reduce malnutrition among 9,000,000 school children, would cost the Department of Agriculture between sixty and ninety million dollars a year, depending on types of food purchased and, of course, the price. This expenditure, of course, contemplates the distribution only of foods widely grown in this country, and for which the Surplus Marketing Administration has conducted surplus removal programs in the past few years.

This cost is based on the continuance of present operations, wherein local sponsors furnish all equipment and labor and the supplementary foods necessary to make a well-rounded meal. The cost to the S. M. A. would be about \$1.10 per child per month—5 cents a meal. With the normal average supplementation by the sponsor, the average child would receive an adequate, nutritionally planned hot lunch, worth, at cost, from 10 to 12 cents each school day.

A table is attached showing the estimated purchases necessary to support a well-planned, nutritious program for 9,000,000 children.

It should be noted that the S. M. A. will spend on the 1941-42 program, which will serve a peak of 6,500,000 children and an average of 4,500,000 children, only about \$30,000,000. The apparent discrepancy between this year's expenditures and those outlined in the table lies chiefly in the fact that the present program does not at all measure up to the best program discussed above. While most of the commodities on the attached table have been available from time to time this year, only a few have been available to all schools all year. In fact, the program has been in extreme jeopardy in a number of low-income areas because the S. M. A. has not been able to supply sufficient of the most-needed foods.

A school-milk program whereby 9,000,000 children would get one-half pint of milk per day at a cost of not more than 1 cent per half-pint would cost approximately \$20,000,000 a year. This estimate is based on the operation of S. M. A.'s present small school-milk program, in which the sponsor or the children pay 1 cent per half-pint and S. M. A. pays the

balance of the cost. Twenty million dollars surely is a small price to pay for so really great a thing.

**Rough estimates of foodstuffs required for school-lunch program to cover five to nine million children<sup>1</sup>**

Commodity	School lunch, 5,000,000 children	School lunch, 9,000,000 children
	Million units	Million units
Dairy products:		
Butter.....pounds.....	30.0	54.0
Dry skim milk.....do.....	22.5	40.5
Poultry products: Eggs.....dozen.....	15.0	27.0
Fruits:		
Apples.....bushels.....	1.3	2.4
Pears.....do.....	.1	.3
Peaches.....do.....	.3	.5
Oranges.....boxes.....	1.5	2.7
Grapefruit.....do.....	2.7	4.8
Dried prunes.....tons.....	11.2	20.2
Raisins.....do.....	11.2	20.2
Vegetables:		
Dry beans.....100-pound bags.....	.2	.4
Potatoes.....do.....	.6	1.1
Onions.....do.....	.1	.1
Fresh tomatoes.....bushels.....	.3	.5
Cabbage.....tons.....	3.7	6.7
Carrots.....bushels.....	.3	.5
Beets.....do.....	.1	.1
Cereal products:		
Flour, wheat equivalent.....bushels.....	.8	1.5
Corn meal and hominy grits, corn equivalent.....bushels.....	.3	.5
Meat products: Pork.....pounds.....	15.0	27.0
Other products:		
Peanut butter.....pounds.....	13.0	23.4
Lard.....pounds.....	15.0	27.0

<sup>1</sup> Program for 5,000,000 children estimated to cost \$45,000,000; program for 9,000,000 children estimated to cost \$90,000,000.  
<sup>2</sup> Thousand tons.

Source of data: Economic Analysis Section, Surplus Marketing Administration, Dec. 8, 1941.

**THE FUTURE FOR AMERICAN AGRICULTURE**

Every farmer in America is being asked to increase his production of foodstuffs as his contribution to the food-for-freedom program. Most all of them will do so.

During the first World War they did the same thing, and when the war was over they were forgotten, and in 1920 there began a depression for American agriculture which lasted—tragic as it is to say it—right down to the outbreak of the present conflict.

We owe a moral obligation at the very least to farmers participating in the food-for-freedom program to see that this same thing does not happen again. And we can fulfill that obligation. The straightforward way to do it is to adopt policies now which will give some reasonable assurance that the bottom will not drop out of the American farmer's market or his prices after the war is won.

It is true, of course, that during the war employment and wages will be at a high level. Some even forecast that before we are finished with this job there will be little or no unemployment.

But that should not affect our adopting now, while it is comparatively easy to do so, sound and farsighted national policies which will stand us in good stead when the war is over. One such policy would be this: America is determined to stamp out undernourishment among her school children.

Such a policy would mean that, both now and in the future, this school-lunch program would be maintained at whatever level was necessary to end undernourishment. Nor would the cost be so

very great. To provide school lunches today for the estimated 9,000,000 undernourished children would require, as has been said, between \$60,000,000 and \$90,000,000—a cheap price indeed for us to pay to enable us to say to all the world that here is one nation that applies its democracy in thoroughgoing fashion where it means the most.

Furthermore, the effect of such a policy would mean that, in the future, should other home markets for the farmers food products be cut down, this one—for school lunches—would correspondingly increase. Nor can the benefit to the farmers be measured solely in the actual number of dollars spent in direct purchases of the supplies for the school lunches. Such purchases, as proven by experience, would help to stiffen prices all along the line in a time of falling prices.

I would not be so foolish as to claim that a program of ending undernourishment among America's children will alone solve our farmers problems for all time to come. But I do say it would be right and just and that it would give the kind of solid assurance to American agriculture which it should have now.

**OUR OWN PEOPLE—AND THE PEOPLE OF OTHER NATIONS**

America is not fighting this war alone. There are other nations fighting on our side and we are pledged to give them every assistance we can. We have undertaken to furnish them with arms and we have undertaken to furnish them with food. Few Americans will disagree with our doing this. But it means that we must be more than ever certain that there are no hungry people in our own land.

**ITEMS FROM LOCAL SOURCES ON NECESSITY FOR, AND VALUE OF SCHOOL LUNCHES**

Here are a few copies of letters from teachers, statements by interested persons, and newspaper stories, testifying to the undernourishment of school children and to the value of the school-lunch program in combatting it.

I am informed that thousands of similar items are in the field offices of the Surplus Marketing Administration.

[From a report by school-lunch representative for Texas]

J. W. Mosely, Collin County, Tex., school superintendent, said that before any of the schools in his county were certified for the receipt of commodities, extensive research was made among all the school children, and the persons making this investigation were amazed to learn the number of empty lunch baskets the children carried to school, just because they were too proud to let anyone know they did not have any lunch. He stated the look on the children's faces when they walk into a lunchroom at noon for a steaming, hot lunch has repaid him a thousand times for any small trouble it might have been to get this program started in Collin County.

[From the Hoosier Sentinel, Daviess County, Ind., of December 1940]

"But it wasn't my turn to eat, teacher." This was the reply a little girl gave the principal of a Daviess County school. The child had fainted at chapel exercises and the principal suspected malnutrition and hunger had brought about the child's collapse.

Further questioning developed a story of deprivation that chilled the teacher's heart.



There were seven children in the little girl's family beside the father and mother. The father was employed on W. P. A. at \$52 a month, and try as she might, the harassed mother could not make ends meet. It was therefore decided that the members of the family would "take turns" at the table at mealtime. Prolonged participation in the "turn taking" and the scanty meals at other times had caused the 13-year-old girl to faint.

School authorities decided to investigate the school-lunch program, to the end that this child and many others in the community who lived in like circumstances could be assured of one good meal a day. Now this child and her brothers and sisters and her schoolmates have nourishing meals every day. There is no longer any need to "take turns" at the family table.

[From the Long Prairie Leader, Todd County, Minn., of February 1941]

At a certain school in the county, it was noticed that a girl who regularly carried a lunch pail to school, never ate her lunch with the other children. The girl would always take her lunch and sit in seclusion during the lunch period. Investigation revealed that the lunch pail was merely a blind; it contained nothing, but the girl pretended to eat, and sat in seclusion because she did not want her schoolmates to know that she did not have any food at the noon hour.

[Letter from school teacher—Alabama]

We have been trying to operate a lunch-room in our school for 3 years, but have not done as well as it seemed that we should. However, this year has started off much better than any previous year. Our attendance is better, the health of the children is above the average, the interest in class has gone up considerably.

The greatest good that is outstanding is the fact that our children seem to have more pep and go in them. Where the children did hang around in the house, they are glad when playtime comes so that they may play.

S. D. WHITTEN,  
Principal, Flint School  
Route 2, Decatur, Ala.

MARCH 5, 1941.

[From a report by school-lunch representative for Texas]

The county-school superintendent of Kaufman County, Tex., and a friend were talking with a teacher in a remote rural school one day when a child appeared with a note which he handed to the teacher. She read it, smiled, and told the child it would be all right.

After he left she read the note to the two men. It had been written by one of the seventh-grade pupils, explaining that he and his brother, the messenger, were necessarily kept out of school that morning to pick some cotton for their father; however, to save them a place at the table because they would be there for lunch and afternoon classes.

[From a report by school-lunch representative in Indiana]

Commenting on the school-lunch project in Carr Township, Ind., a public-health nurse said: "The most noticeable thing to us about this program other than the physical improvement was the mental attitude.

"Our indigent cases have always slipped off to a corner or eaten their entire lunch from their lunch basket or newspaper with head ducked because of embarrassment about the lunch's contents. But now they can sit with heads up and share the same foods and enjoy lunch hour."

DECEMBER 1940.

[Letter from school teacher, Missouri]

The children in this school are all from very poor families, part of them coming to school without lunch and part bringing very little. On one occasion one family of children brought only popcorn for lunch, while most of the time they brought nothing at all. The commodities are certainly needed here as at times I have had to buy food for them. It is very unpleasant to see children come to school without food.

Now we have at least one hot dish every day. I have taught in rural schools for 15 years and in that time have seen many children come to school without food. I believe the surplus commodities are responsible for making many children well and happy, and I am quite sure is doing a great deal of good.

MARY MCBRIAN,  
Teacher, Elk Grove School,  
Caldwell County, Mo.

JANUARY 1941.

[From a report by a school-lunch representative in Texas, February 1941]

Mr. R. B. Cunningham, of Dallas, visited the Rand colored school in Egypt settlement, Kaufman County, where he contacted the principal of the school. The Rand colored school is operating the hot-lunch program with Work Projects Administration assistance. Mr. Cunningham said that everything about the school was immaculately clean. One corner of the schoolroom had been partitioned off for space for a kitchen and pantry. The noonday meal was being prepared at the time of his visit, and among other things being prepared was a large pan of rice pudding, in which they were using rice, evaporated milk, butter, and raisins supplied by the commodity department. Seventy-five children are being served lunch at this school. The principal told Mr. Cunningham that now daily attendance remains stationary at approximately 89 percent, whereas prior to the hot-lunch program the daily attendance was always less than 75 percent.

[Letter from a Missouri school teacher, January 1941]

We feel that the hot-lunch program is one of the best things the State of Missouri has done for the children in many years. I find that my school children have gained from 3 to 10 pounds of flesh since we started about the first of September. This is my second year to sponsor the hot-lunch program, and I find that it also helps attendance. Wish to say that our program is working perfectly, and we are very grateful to the State of Missouri for it.

PEARL BEAL,  
Teacher, Middle Smith School,  
District 104, Stoddard County, Mo.

Notice that Miss Beal does not even mention the Federal Government or the Department of Agriculture at all. Which surely proves that this program far from fostering dependence upon Washington is actually developing an increased degree of local responsibility.

USE OF ESTABLISHED SCHOOL-LUNCH PROGRAMS AS A BASIS FOR COMMUNITY FEEDING STATIONS IN EMERGENCIES

How an established school-lunch program can serve in an emergency where a large number of people must be fed, is aptly illustrated by the following item from the Lincoln County (Mo.) Social Security News for October 1941:

The hot-lunch program in the Silcox schools, which has been operating so successfully the past couple of years, found that it was in a position in the recent flood to fill a very

definite need. As every home with the exception of 2 in that community was badly flooded, the people not only did not have any place to eat, but did not have any food, as practically all foodstuffs were destroyed. As classes were closed for several days, it was broadcast by a public-address system in Silcox that meals would be fed to all comers in the dining room of the school. During the first 3 days after the flood, over 500 persons a day were fed hot, well-balanced meals, and 3 times a day. The Social Security office allocated extra (S. M. A.) commodities for this emergency, and additional foods were purchased by individuals and other organizations. Without a doubt, the people of the Silcox community are sold on their hot-lunch programs now, more than ever before.

The Surplus Marketing Administration is now storing in strategic centers quantities of food which, in case of an emergency, can be quickly made available for distribution to the distressed population. In such situations, well set-up school-lunch operations would be invaluable for feeding people who would be unable to prepare their own food.

HOW CHILDREN IMPROVED IN ATTENDANCE AND SCHOLARSHIP IN SCHOOLS HAVING SCHOOL-LUNCH PROGRAMS—A SCIENTIFIC STUDY.

While it is difficult to measure benefits of a school-lunch program objectively, a study in Camden County, Mo., by the county superintendent of schools and the secretary-director of the State social security commission seems to merit attention.

The study was made from records in the county superintendent's office after the close of the school term, so that neither teachers nor pupils knew of the study. Ten schools were surveyed which served a hot lunch during the 1940 school year, but had not done so the previous year. Ten similar schools which had no lunch program either year were selected as a control group. An attempt was made to pair the schools in the two groups, so that the control group would be the same as the survey group as to location, enrollment, and economic conditions of the families served. All 20 schools were rural and nonconsolidated, and 12—6 in each group—had the same teachers both years.

#### Attendance

The percentage of daily attendance to enrollment for the two groups is shown below:

	Percent attendance 1938-39	Percent attendance 1939-40	Gain in percent attendance
Control group.....	69.18	70.54	1.36
Survey group.....	70.99	84.34	13.35

<sup>1</sup> School lunch served to this group.

Reference to the above table shows that the control group, which did not serve lunch either year, had an attendance of about 70 percent for each year. However, the survey group, which also had approximately 70-percent attendance in the 1939 school year, jumped to 84-percent attendance in 1940, after a school-lunch program was started. Inasmuch as the schools in the two groups were similar in every respect—including attendance in 1939—there seems no reason

to doubt that the lunch program was instrumental in bringing about the increased attendance. This study bears out less objective observations on the same subject by teachers and other interested persons. Hundreds of letters to S. M. A. representatives have spoken of better attendance as a result of school-lunch programs.

#### Scholarship

Since it was recognized that any grading system is extremely subjective, only the 12 schools having the same teachers both years were used in the scholarship study. To eliminate a possible error because of difference in innate intelligence, only the grades of children who were in school both years were used in the study.

A system of grade points was used in determining scholarship. An excellent mark was given 4 points; superior, 3; average, 2; poor, 1; failure, 0. The following table shows total grade points for the children for the 2 years studied:

	Grade points, 1938-39	Grade points, 1939-40	Percent change
Control group (52 children)....	1,056	1,055	-0.09
Survey group (75 children)....	1,614	1,763	9.23

<sup>1</sup> School lunch served to this group.

As in the attendance study, no significant change is seen between the 2 years in the control group. However, in the survey group grades were markedly higher after the institution of the school lunch program. Again this bears out statements from teachers referring to better discipline, better attention, and higher marks because of school lunches.

Is this work worth while? Is it worth making a stable part of America's principles of justice and government? I believe with all my soul it is. My bill, in the nature of an amendment to section 32 of Public Law 320, will make that possible. I commend it to the House and to the people of America.

The text of my amendment and the text of section 32 as presently written follow:

#### SECTION 32 AS PROPOSED TO BE AMENDED BY VOORHIS BILL

A bill to amend section 32 of Public Act No. 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 774), as amended

Be it enacted, etc., That section 32 of Public Act No. 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 774), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 32. There is hereby appropriated for each fiscal year beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, an amount equal to 30 per centum of the gross receipts from duties collected under the customs laws during the period January 1 to December 31, both inclusive, preceding the beginning of each such fiscal year. There are authorized to be appropriated, in addition to the amount herein appropriated, such amounts as the Congress may, from time to time, deem necessary for the accomplishment of the purposes of this section. [Such] The sums appropriated by this section or pursuant to the authorization herein contained shall be maintained in a separate fund and shall be used by the Secretary of Agriculture only to (1) encourage the exportation of agricultural commodities and products

thereof by the payment of benefits in connection with the exportation thereof or of indemnities for losses incurred in connection with such exportation or by payments to producers in connection with the production of that part of any agricultural commodity required for domestic consumption; (2) [encourage the domestic consumption of such commodities or products by diverting them, by the payment of benefits or indemnities or by other means] divert from the normal channels of trade and commerce agricultural commodities and products thereof, by the payment of benefits or indemnities or by other means; or [by increasing their utilization] increase the utilization of such commodities and products, through benefits indemnities, donations, or by other means, among persons in low-income groups [as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture]; or distribute such commodities and products through school-lunch and child feeding programs; and/or (3) reestablish farmers' purchasing power by making payments in connection with the normal production of any agricultural commodity or product thereof for domestic consumption. Determinations by the Secretary as to what constitutes diversion, [and what constitutes] normal channels of trade and commerce, low-income groups, and [what constitutes] normal production for domestic consumption shall be final. The sums appropriated under this section shall be expended for such one or more of the above specified purposes, and at such times, in such manner, and in such amounts as the Secretary of Agriculture finds will effectuate substantial accomplishment of any one or more of the purposes of this section. Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the amount that may be devoted, during any fiscal year after June 30, 1939, to any one agricultural commodity or the products thereof in such fiscal year, shall not exceed 25 per centum of the funds available under this section for such fiscal year: Provided, however, that this 25 per centum provision shall not apply to amounts devoted to a stamp plan used to effectuate the purposes of this section, and, notwithstanding expenditures under such stamp plan, the 25 per centum provision shall continue to be calculated on the aggregate amount available for the purposes of this section.

"The provisions of Public Act No. 165, 75th Congress, approved June 28, 1937, as amended, relating to the expenditure of funds transferred to the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation shall be applicable to expenditures made by the Secretary in carrying out clauses (1) and (2) hereof. The Secretary of Agriculture shall submit to Congress, on the first day of each regular session, a report setting forth his operations in carrying out the purposes of this section and the expenditures made in connection therewith.

#### SECTION 32, AS NOW WRITTEN

Sec. 32. There is hereby appropriated for each fiscal year beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, an amount equal to 30 per cent of the gross receipts from duties collected under the customs laws during the period January 1 to December 31, both inclusive, preceding the beginning of each such fiscal year. Such sums shall be maintained in a separate fund and shall be used by the Secretary of Agriculture only to (1) encourage the exportation of agricultural commodities and products thereof by the payment of benefits in connection with the exportation thereof or of indemnities for losses incurred in connection with such exportation or by payments to producers in connection with the production of that part of any agricultural commodity required for domestic consumption; (2) encourage the domestic consumption of such commodities or products by diverting them, by the payment of benefits or indemnities or by other means, from the normal channels of trade and commerce or by

increasing their utilization through benefits, indemnities, donations, or by other means, among persons in low-income groups as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture; and (3) reestablish farmers' purchasing power by making payments in connection with the normal production of any agricultural commodity for domestic consumption. Determinations by the Secretary as to what constitutes diversion and what constitutes normal channels of trade and commerce and what constitutes normal production for domestic consumption shall be final. The sums appropriated under this section shall be expended for such one or more of the above-specified purposes, and at such times, in such manner, and in such amounts as the Secretary of Agriculture finds will effectuate substantial accomplishment of any one or more of the purposes of this section. Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the amount that may be devoted, during any fiscal year after June 30, 1939, to any one agricultural commodity or the products thereof in such fiscal year, shall not exceed 25 per cent of the funds available under this section for such fiscal year.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] for 15 minutes.

#### NORWAY

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to remind the Members of the House that today is the second anniversary of the invasion of Norway by our common enemy, Nazi Germany.

We must not lose the significance of this day. Norway before April 1940 was a free country. Liberty was the birthright of the Norwegian, and he treasured that most valuable human possession as much as we do.

Not that love of freedom is a characteristic peculiar to the Norwegian. Not at all. Many another nation has treasured her liberty—and lost it to the Nazi conqueror.

What is peculiar to Norway is her behavior after she was invaded by Hitler's armies, and supposedly had been conquered. True, she had all the outer manifestations of a conquered nation—with a Nazi occupation force with a puppet government chosen from a handful of Norwegian traitors.

But 99 percent of Norway's people did not like the idea of a foreign ruler. Even worse was the traitor Quisling and his aides, who in the eyes of this overwhelming majority were contemptible and loathsome men.

And so Norway's people decided to join us actively in the United Nations' battle to defeat Hitler.

We must not underestimate this decision. Norway's merchant fleet at the start of this war was the fastest, the most modern, and the fourth largest in the world. It was the biggest prize of the oceans, and a vital force in Britain's battle to survive. History may well prove that Norway's choice was a decisive factor in the ultimate victory of the United Nations.

The role of Norway's gallant fleet will go down in history as one of the most heroic and brilliant efforts of the United Nations in this war.

The inspiration for this high endeavor of Norwegian seamen stems not only from their intense desire to free Norway



from the German invaders, but equally from the amazing strength of resistance within Norway itself to the conquerors.

For as important as Norway's fight for the United Nations by sea has been her inspirational fight by land.

All Norway is in revolt. Norwegians have not forgotten how the treacherous Germans swept down upon Norway in April 1940, releasing deadly bombs on Norwegian civilians while they proclaimed that they were protecting Norway against British designs.

Norwegians have not forgotten, too, how they took starving German children in their homes after the first World War, only to have these same children, grown up now, turn their guns on Norwegian children.

These are things a Norwegian cannot forget. And so the Norwegians in Norway have staged a grim and bitter rebellion against their conquerors.

Long before the attack on Pearl Harbor, the American people had a deep hatred for the Axis enemy who could so brutally and treacherously attack a relatively undefended people.

We followed with the most intense feeling the efforts of the people in Norway to strike at their Nazi oppressors.

But now this struggle of the Norwegian people is our concern in a greater sense. The success of the Norwegian revolt against the Nazis is as vital as the struggle of every other link in our widespread United Nations front fighting the Axis enemies.

As I speak today, eleven hundred Norwegian clergymen have resigned their posts in protest against the laws of the traitor Quisling regime.

After Quisling was appointed Premier-President of Norway by his Nazi masters on February 1, he passed a law requiring all Norwegian children from the age of 10 to 18 to join the Norwegian Nazi youth organization.

This would mean that Norway's children would be under complete control of the Nazis. They would be taught only what the Nazis wanted them to be taught—the bestial, vicious Nazi way of thought and life.

This Norway's people could not permit.

First the seven bishops of the Norwegian State Church resigned. On the eve of their mass resignation, February 24, each bishop stated:

The spiritual activity which is given by ordination at the Lord's altar is still mine by divine and human law. I will still exercise this vocation so far as is in the power of one not in office.

Quisling thought differently. On Good Friday and on Easter, the bishops were ordered to stay in their homes, and storm troopers were put on guard to make sure that they did.

No bishops appeared in the Norwegian churches on Easter. But the waiting congregations were not disappointed. For the Easter message of the Norwegian Church this year was the mass resignation of all Norway's clergymen from their posts. Following the example of their bishops, they took this way of protesting against Nazi attempts to control the youth of Norway.

Quisling calls this insurrection and war. The Norwegian churchmen call it the fight to be free. And these courageous clergymen say that they will be leading their congregations next Sunday, for they still consider themselves the true ministers of the Norwegian people.

The protest against the Quisling youth law was taken up by the teachers as well. Shortly after the action of the bishops, more than 9,000 of Norway's 10,000 teachers resigned from the nazified teachers' union. Two thousand of them are now in concentration camps or toiling at hard labor on the railroads in the far north.

The rebellious voice of Norway may be heard too from the lawyers, who have resigned from the lawyers' association, thereby risking disbarment; from the doctors, who refuse to continue in the hospitals which have been taken over by the Nazis; from the athletes, who will not participate in Quisling-managed sports events; from thousands of other patriots who quietly conduct campaigns of sabotage which produce mysterious train wrecks, landslides, and even the strange unexplained deaths of German guards.

You may ask how the Norwegians manage to do these things without being shot. The answer is that many of them are shot. But there are always more brave people to take their places.

Not long ago two well-known Norwegian athletes died suddenly in a German prison in Oslo. One, Kristian Auber, was 30 years old. He had been arrested for reasons unknown on February 5. He was in perfect health when taken to prison, but he died there on February 20. He had been so fearfully mauled by his Nazi captors that his family was never permitted to see either his body or his clothes.

The other victim, Tor Salvesen, was only twenty-nine. He, too, was in perfect health when arrested. He died within a fortnight after his internment. No explanation was ever given.

Within a few days, the Norwegian White Book will be released in this country, containing further authenticated, first-hand accounts of Nazi torture in the German prison in Norway. Released by the Norwegian Government in London, it is now in the process of translation here in Washington.

These are not isolated cases. They have happened too tragically often before this to people in every occupied country who have resisted Nazi tyranny.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, my colleague is making a very interesting statement about a great country, and it was my good fortune in 1937 to visit Norway, and of the 12 European countries which I have visited, there was none more peaceful, more prosperous, and apparently happier than the people of Norway. I was impressed with the churches which were built out in the rural sections of the country, and in the small towns, and in the cities. Everywhere it seemed that the people were devoutly religious, a very fine, kind-

hearted, generous people. It is tragic to me to think of the awful experience through which they are going, due to the torture of Hitler and his gang, and I am sure that with the fine spirit those people have, they will yet arise and be free.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the gentleman from Texas, the ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, for his fine statement.

It is to stop the torture of innocent people by brutal dictators that we are fighting this war against the Axis. It is to free the people of the occupied countries, as well as to defend the freedom of our own America, that we are straining every resource at our command.

We will never rest until Norway, and every other nation which has felt the oppressive hand of the Axis is free.

#### THE SACRIFICES OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, at this time one cannot help but observe the wonderful sacrifices of the American people and the marvelous things they are doing. They are getting along without just about everything back home, as the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL] remarked a few moments ago. They will soon have their sugar rationed, and a great many other items, which they are gladly giving up, or lessening their supply of, so that the forces of aggression can be thrust back and conquered. It is my hope that this Congress will recognize what they are doing.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Under previous order of the House the Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] for 10 minutes.

#### MAGNESIUM

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, on March 17 I spoke on the floor of this House with reference to the subject of magnesium. Subsequently a newspaper column referred to that as an unreported speech. I recognize that this one may meet the same fate, but I hope to call to the attention of those persons here today, and to the people of the United States, things I regard as significant in the production of magnesium, a critical and essential war mineral.

This morning's issue of the Washington Post carries a story, copyrighted by the New York Tribune, Inc., explaining that a consent decree against the Aluminum Co. of America ending a patent-pool agreement with the German chemical trust I. G. Farbenindustrie, is expected to be acted upon within the next few days by the entering of a consent decree. That statement would leave the impression that the Aluminum Co. of America was going to be the only company involved in the magnesium production conspiracy suit.

I think it important to call the attention of this Congress to the fact that, just as in the case of rubber patents where the Standard Oil Co. was involved

with I. G. Farben, of Germany, so in this instance in the case of the magnesium production restriction suit, the Aluminum Co. of America is not the only person involved and not the principal person involved. If I thought that Thurman Arnold's division would be so lax in its duties as to find only the Aluminum Co. of America, I would have lost long ago a great deal of the respect I hold for that gentleman. But I am convinced that when the story of this Federal decree is published in the newspapers it will show that the suit is not only against the Aluminum Co. of America, but against the Dow Chemical Co., whose sole reputation has been made as a producer of magnesium; and against also the American Magnesium Corporation, owned by Alcoa, and against the Magnesium Development Corporation, a patent-holding company which licenses only the Dow Chemical Co. to manufacture magnesium in America.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield.

Mr. PITTENGER. Do you not think that Thurman Arnold has done an outstanding job in calling attention to these various problems?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Yes. I think Thurman Arnold has done an outstanding job in calling attention to these problems. I think when the story of what has happened in our magnesium situation is told we will be as grateful to Thurman Arnold for developing that information as we are grateful to him for finding out why it is that German panzer divisions now roll across Europe on synthetic rubber while we in America cannot have it.

Mr. PITTENGER. If the gentleman will pardon me, I would like to say that I think Thurman Arnold is one of the ablest men in administration circles.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I thank the gentleman.

I desire at this time to refer briefly to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 9, 1940, in which you will find remarks by my colleague from California [Mr. VOORHIS] on the subject of these anti-trust prosecutions. You will find that away back there, long before we got into this defense activity, there was pointed out to this House the fact that Germany produced 12,000 of the 22,000 tons of magnesium produced in this world in 1939, and that the United States produced 2,410 tons only, because it was restricted by various deals which Dow had with the German companies.

I desire to call the attention of this House to the fact that these companies are, or should be, and I hope will be, named in this consent decree. Not only the Aluminum Co. of America, as this newspaper article would have you believe, but as the man who wrote the article, I think, could easily have found out, the Dow Chemical Co., the American Magnesium Corporation, and the Magnesium Development Corporation.

I desire to point out something else that has not had a great deal of attention so far. It is the fact that on April 4 there was a vesting order signed by Leo T. Crowley, Alien Property Custodian,

that took charge of some very important stock of this Magnesium Development Corporation. If you desire further information on it I can refer you to the Federal Register for Thursday, April 9, page 2698, where title VIII lists actions against aliens in nationality, and points out the vesting order by which Leo T. Crowley, Alien Property Custodian, has taken over half the stock of the Magnesium Development Corporation. That is a matter of official record which I trust will get more attention in the newspapers, because the Aluminum Co. of America owns the other half of that stock.

Now, who was the owner of the half interest which Mr. Crowley took over? It was the I. G. Farbenindustrie, the German Dye and Chemical Trust. I think it is important to remember that this stock has now reached the city of Washington and can be voted by Mr. Crowley. That is important, because if that permission had not been obtained the stock of that company could not now be voted to permit the magnesium producers in the United States to make use of these important patents.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. As I recall it, in connection with another speech which the gentleman recently made on this same subject, he pointed out that the price of magnesium had always been maintained at a considerably higher figure than the price of aluminum. Is that not correct?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Yes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The gentleman also states that there were proven processes for the production of magnesium which could bring the price of magnesium down very much lower than it now is. My question is, Is it not true that magnesium competes with aluminum for certain uses, and in certain respects, such as in some airplane construction, is positively superior to aluminum?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. The gentleman is correct. The price of magnesium has been running around 22 to 25 cents a pound. Some of the processes which I described on March 17 seem to offer possibilities of producing magnesium at from 4 to 5 cents a pound. The gentleman is quite correct in referring to its competitive nature against certain types of aluminum, because now we must recognize that many of our processes require magnesium if the aluminum is to be strong enough to be actually used for dive-bombing purposes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield again, briefly?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. It therefore becomes of extreme significance that an aluminum corporation should control the patent rights on a development of magnesium, does it not?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Highly significant, but not too strange when you understand all of the processes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. These patent rights should be available to the United States and the development of these processes should be pressed to the greatest possible extent.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. It is extremely important that the development should be stressed.

I desire further to call to the attention of this House the fact that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for April 3, at page 3319, contains some very interesting reading. I have read that and was not too surprised to find that certain officials of Basic Magnesium, Inc., were drawing tremendous salaries all out of proportion to what they could possibly be entitled. I think that the genealogy, if I may so designate it, of Basic Magnesium, Inc., is very interesting. I hope to be able to convince you that I. G. Farbenindustrie—the German Dye Trust—has an interest in that great plant. Let me point out to you that Magnesium Electron, Ltd., a British firm, controls Basic Magnesium, Inc. This statement has been made to me by officials of the W. P. B. I do not believe it is very hard to prove the facts, and I suggest that the members of the Truman committee, or some other committee which has the power to subpoena witnesses under oath, which I as an individual do not possess, can very quickly establish the facts.

So, I say, Magnesium Electron Limited controls Basic Magnesium, Incorporated. Magnesium Electron, Limited, was owned one-half by I. G. Farbenindustrie. Eventually the British Alien Property Custodian took over that half of the stock. Here you see that a German holding company owned a half interest in a British company which in turn owned control of Basic Magnesium, Incorporated, which is building its great plant at Las Vegas, Nev. Some of the results of that unholy alliance were outlined in another body not too long ago.

I think it is an extremely unusual situation when our own companies, owned by citizens who try to develop magnesium in America, cannot do it; but the I. G. Farbenindustrie, because it has working arrangements with Dow Chemical Co. and the Aluminum Co. of America, get that sort of concession from the American people—get it approved by the War Production Board and financed by Defense Plants Corporation. I think it is too bad, for example, that the territory served by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. LEAVY], and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE] cannot have a certain type of development, yet the great Basic Magnesium plant can be built, and approved quickly and speedily because it seems to have some connection with the German dye and chemical trust.

I hope in the next day or two, also, to call the attention of this House to the peculiar manufacturing process which is now being exploited as our newest great savior in the magnesium business. I refer to the ferro-silicon process that I mentioned on March 17. The process then was not in operation, it was on the drawing boards, but it was going to be the great producer of magnesium. So we were promised last October, so we were promised in January, so we were



promised in this great month of April; but nothing concrete yet has happened. This seems to bear out what I have previously called to your attention.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield.

Mr. LEAVY. I am wondering if the gentleman saw the announcement in the press this morning that the Dow Chemical Co. and the Aluminum Co. of America, who are under indictment jointly with the I. G. Farbenindustrie, are agreeing that a consent decree may be entered on criminal charges now pending against them and will pay the fines and release the patents?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Yes. I have referred to that, and that is the occasion for these remarks.

Mr. LEAVY. Yes; but does it not seem unfortunate that this great Nation in its hour of peril must depend upon a group whose misconduct will have been officially established, in connection with strangling production by contract agreement with our enemies?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I entirely agree; no one should overlook that point.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. There are great deposits of magnesium in the gentleman's State of New Mexico, and in my State of Oklahoma. Does not the gentleman believe it would be wise to develop these deposits during this emergency?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I believe it would be wise, but I think it would be extremely difficult unless you have a tie-up with I. G. Farbenindustrie—and this we do not in New Mexico nor do you in Oklahoma. Otherwise, I think it would be difficult to develop.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. That is right.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. It will be interesting to see what happens in the case of Basic Magnesium and I. G. Farbenindustrie. It is too bad that the purely domestic companies that we should rely upon should have this type of competition in their production. It may be developed in a short time that a Government official has returned to Washington, within the last 48 hours, with news concerning the Permanente plant. What that news is ought to be of interest to the War Department. It certainly has been of interest to me. I think you will find when it is revealed that that plant cannot be expected to carry the load heretofore assigned to it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. "Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]?"

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, in closing, may I suggest that the House of Representatives, and certainly the War Production Board, has a responsibility to check this magnesium

situation. The people of this country cannot be expected to be complacent forever when they find that their great resources needed for incendiary bombs and for dive bombers are in the hands of the enemy. I think it is a situation that long ago should have been corrected, and certainly should be corrected now.

[Here the gavel fell.]

#### ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker pro tempore:

H. J. Res. 263. Joint resolution to provide decorations for outstanding conduct or service by persons serving in the American merchant marine.

#### BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

On April 6, 1942:

H. R. 6554. An act to amend war-risk insurance provisions of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, in order to expedite ocean transportation and assist the war effort.

On April 7, 1942:

H. R. 6483. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 59 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, April 13, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### COMMITTEE HEARINGS

##### COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Tuesday, April 14, 1942. Business to be considered: Hearings along the line of the Sanders bill, H. R. 5497, and other matters connected with the Federal Communications Commission.

##### COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, April 23, 1942, at 10 o'clock a. m. on H. R. 6885, to aid in the prosecution of the war effort by providing for the temporary suspension of the operation of State laws imposing restrictions with respect to menhaden fishing.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1554. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report of the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1941; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1555. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of Secretary's order canceling certain charges existing as debts due the United States by individual Indians and tribes of Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

1556. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a request received from the Governor of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1557. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of a resolution from the Governor of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1558. A letter from the board of trustees of the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund, transmitting their second annual report (H. Doc. No. 694); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed, with illustration.

1559. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of Anthony W. Livingston; to the Committee on Claims.

1560. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act approved February 4, 1919 (40 Stat. 1056), entitled "An act to provide for the award of Medals of Honor, Distinguished Service Medals, and Navy Crosses, and for other purposes," so as to change the conditions for the award of medals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

1561. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide additional pay for personnel of the United States Navy assigned to duty on submarines and to diving duty; to include additional pay for diving in depths of less than 90 feet under certain conditions, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. McLaughlin: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 271. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1942, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; without amendment (Rept. No. 1994). Referred to the House Calendar.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COFFEE of Washington: Committee on Claims. S. 1424. An act for the relief of Mary J. Crabtree; without amendment (Rept. No. 1970). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington: Committee on Claims. S. 1757. An act for the relief of Clyde Kingery; without amendment (Rept. No. 1971). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington: Committee on Claims. S. 1765. An act for the relief of the minor children of Mrs. Jesús Zamora Felix, deceased; with amendment (Rept. No. 1972). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington: Committee on Claims. S. 1899. An act for the relief of

Lawrence Brizendine; with amendment (Rept. No. 1973). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GILLETTE: Committee on Claims. S. 1991. An act for the relief of Mrs. William Meister; without amendment (Rept. No. 1974). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington: Committee on Claims. S. 1993. An act for the relief of Pasqualina Lazzaro; without amendment (Rept. No. 1975). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington: Committee on Claims. S. 2017. An act to amend Private Act No. 446, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved July 2, 1940, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1976). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas: Committee on Claims. S. 2116. An act for the relief of Frank S. Mathias and Elsie Mathias; without amendment (Rept. No. 1977). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WEISS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2056. A bill for the relief of the L. J. Houze Convex Glass Co.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1978). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WEISS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4251. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Mount Vernon, Alexandria & Washington Railway Co., a corporation; without amendment (Rept. No. 1979). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WEISS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4370. A bill for the relief of Charles L. Lair; with amendment (Rept. No. 1980). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SAUTHOFF: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4923. A bill for the relief of Georgie Knox and Orion Knox; with amendment (Rept. No. 1981). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SAUTHOFF: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5070. A bill for the relief of Francis Corwin Circle; with amendment (Rept. No. 1982). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5275. A bill for the relief of Weslie A. Coulter, Sr.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1983). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5317. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jessie A. Beechwood; with amendment (Rept. No. 1984). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5329. A bill for the relief of J. J. McIntosh; with amendment (Rept. No. 1985). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SAUTHOFF: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5499. A bill for the relief of Henry Daley, guardian for James Ray Daley and Norman Franklin Daley; without amendment (Rept. No. 1986). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5565. A bill for the relief of Mrs. J. R. Bennett; without amendment (Rept. No. 1987). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WEISS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5723. A bill for the relief of Anna Danielson and Betty Tiedeman; with amendment (Rept. No. 1988). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WEISS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5847. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Julia Campbell; with amendment (Rept. No. 1989). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SAUTHOFF: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5920. A bill for the relief of E. A. Williams; with amendment (Rept. No. 1990). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5955. A bill for the relief of Harold

W. Burch and Lucille M. Burch; with amendment (Rept. No. 1991). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MCGEEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6557. A bill for the relief of James Gilmore and Marion Gilmore; with amendment (Rept. No. 1992). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington: Committee on Claims. S. 2002. An act for the relief of Donald William Burt; with amendment (Rept. No. 1993). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H. R. 6908. A bill to amend the Defense Highway Act of 1941; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 6909. A bill to change the name of Woodley Place in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BEITER:

H. R. 6910. A bill to authorize the Federal Works Administration to construct synthetic rubber production plants having an annual productive capacity of 400,000 tons and to create the United States Rubber Authority to operate such plants; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 6911. A bill to implement article 28 of the convention signed at Geneva on July 27, 1929, and proclaimed by the President on August 4, 1932 (47 Stat. 2074, 2092), by making it a criminal offense for any person to use the emblem and name of the Red Cross for commercial or other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CRAVENS:

H. R. 6912. A bill to repeal section 404 of title 11 of United States Code, 1940 edition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LUDLOW:

H. R. 6913. A bill to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the seventy-sixth anniversary convention of the Grand Army of the Republic to be held at Indianapolis, Ind., September 13 to 18, inclusive, 1942; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 6914. A bill to amend section 32 of Public Act No. 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 774), as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOBBS:

H. R. 6915. A bill to invest the Circuit Court of Appeals of the United States with original and exclusive jurisdiction to review the question of the legality of the detention of any alien detained under title II or title III; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. BLAND introduced a bill (H. R. 6916) for the relief of the Baltimore, Crisfield & Onancock Line, which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2653. By Mr. BEITER: Petition of the Senate of the State of New York, to provide benefits to civilians who may be injured or killed by reason of enemy action; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2654. Also, petition of the Assembly of the State of New York, to amend the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2655. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of the Legislature of the State of New York, urging the Congress to foster legislation providing benefits to civilians or dependents who may be injured or killed by reason of enemy action, which benefits shall be a charge upon the whole people of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2656. Also, petition of the Joint Conference of Affiliated Postal Employees of Greater New York and Vicinity, urging the expeditious passage of the Sweeney bill (H. R. 6486) by the Congress of the United States; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

2657. Also, petition of the Legislature of the State of New York, urging the Congress of the United States to amend the Social Security Act to provide that all employees who were formerly covered by the social-security law and who heretofore made contributions thereto in the form of employee tax, and who became ineligible through no action or choice on their part, may again become eligible under the social-security law for social-security benefits upon signifying their willingness to pay, not only the amount of employee contributions, but also the amount of employer contributions which their present employer would have been required to pay if such employer were covered by the law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2658. By Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Petition of 60 citizens of Lacona, Iowa, and vicinity, advocating the enactment of Senate bill 860 so as to give the young men of 1942 the protection their fathers had in 1917; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2659. By Mr. KEOGH: Petition of the Joint Conference of Affiliated Postal Employees of Greater New York and Vicinity, favoring the passage of the Sweeney bill (H. R. 6486); to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

2660. By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa: Petition of Mrs. J. A. Hawthorne, president, Women's Christian Temperance Union, and other citizens of Washington, Iowa, urging the passage of Senate bill 860 as a contribution to a wholesome defense program; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2661. By Mr. TINKHAM: Petition of sundry residents of Boston, favoring the Townsend bill (H. R. 1036); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## SENATE

MONDAY, APRIL 13, 1942

(Legislative day of Monday, March 30, 1942)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Reverend Theodore O. Wedel, canon, Washington Cathedral, offered the following prayer:

O Almighty God, ruler of heaven and earth, raise up, we pray Thee, Thy power, and come among us, and with great might succor us; that whereas, through our sins and our weaknesses we are sore hindered in the tasks which we face at this crisis of our history, Thy grace and mercy may speedily help and deliver us. To Thee it belongeth to punish wrong and to defend justice and right. Save us, we humbly beseech Thee, from the hands of our enemies; that we, being armed with Thy defense, may be preserved to glorify Thee in a new age